

THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF DELINQUENCY

Vol. VI

April, 1956

No. 4

EDITORIAL

It is interesting to consider Dr. Gibbens' article on Cruelty to Children in conjunction with the Report on Neglectful Parents, published by the Magistrates' Association (Supplement—*The Magistrate*, Vol. XII, No. 1, January 1956). While most persons are naturally distressed and horrified at the kind of behaviour of which some parents are capable, few are yet able to view such behaviour in the light of psychopathic causes. Gibbens brings out this aspect of the problem, stressing the fact that readjustment cannot be achieved even with imprisonment unless the underlying psychological causes are tackled by therapeutic instruments. The Magistrates' Report moves perhaps on a more sociological plane and covers also neglectfulness which, in the long run, can be as harmful to the child as sudden or sustained brutality. The neglectful parent has been usually enmeshed in a complex causal network—immaturity of emotional and intellectual development, poor economic conditions; and bad social habits are created by these factors. Retraining is perhaps the major therapeutic instrument, particularly the force of example given by social workers, themselves married, who can impart household management, common sense, and—to use a banal term—emotional decency. The Magistrates' Report stresses the various ways in which neglectful and cruel parents can best be brought to public notice, and thereby made, through their appearance in the adult or juvenile courts, to face responsibility more through retraining than by punitive methods—although the latter, in the absence of psychopathy, may be a means of correcting conduct by the pain of segregation and the ignominy they entail.

Any institution which dichotomizes the administrators from the administered must set up tension on both sides. These stresses are created in any system, a factory for example, which is divided as regards authority between

management and workers; and they arise from such causes as discontent on the one side and, say, impatience with output on the other. As de Berker makes clear in his essay, the problem of sources of stress and anxiety will vary probably very sharply as between different types of institution, nicely balanced as in a factory where there is a quasi-contractual relation between managers and workers, and in such institutions—to be described as correctional in a broad sense—as rehabilitation centres for malcontent and chronically unemployed, Borstals, approved schools and perhaps even the prison of to-day and to-morrow. The morale of a staff must spring not from a sense of its rôle, but from the staff's conception of the human material of which it takes charge. Where there is the need to 'correct' as well as to guide behaviour and work, the moral factor immediately intrudes. The workers or trainees cannot be regarded as falling short somewhere, authority must impose and those who impose must feel some measure of guilt in so doing. In former times, relationship between a staff and the inmates was sufficiently rigid that behaviour was a function of the rules laid down by authority; obedience to rule being a condition of membership. Dismissal, fine or punishment defined the limits of infringement according to the type of the institution. To-day institutions from factory to approved school or rehabilitating centre have become acutely self-conscious on both sides. The staff, aware of its ameliorative function, to improve persons in work and general social conduct, becomes equally aware of the malcontent and feelings of frustration in the administered, and therefore hatred-anxiety is felt if not let loose. De Berker deals, as will be seen, with these issues, showing how permissiveness in the modern psychological sense must be understood in terms of the irreconcilable forces involved in identification and resistance to it. The solution, if anything, lies in attempts to establish a relation based not solely on justice, but on a commonly shared notion of freedom, a sense of being both subject to the rules of a game. The staff must appreciate that the tension set up in themselves may spring from a desire not to give freedom to those whose moral nature does not appear to them to deserve it.

To those interested in further research on the internal structure of penal and reformatory institutions, it is a matter of regret that Mr. Rose has not been able to carry out the more comprehensive sociological study of an open Borstal which he had originally envisaged. It is obvious, however, that the requirements of administrative routine have to be given preference. Nevertheless, apparently by accident rather than design, the opportunity arose for a small-scale sociometric enquiry, very much on the lines with which we have become familiar through the work of Moreno and his followers. The choice confronting the Borstal lads was with whom they would like, or

dislike, to go camping. As Mr. Rose points out, no repetition of the questionnaire was possible to test the reality and permanent nature of the attitudes behind the choices. Even so, as usual in studies of this kind, the results are of some value as indicating the degree of integration within the different houses and dormitories of the Institution. The question arose how far sociometric choices can be used to sort out leaders and followers, but on this the author had to rely on information obtained from the House-masters rather than on the answers to his questionnaire. Sociometric choice, it appears from his material, bears very little relationship to leadership; there are, as he puts it, 'numerous reasons why a boy might be popular', and receive many choices, and the same may be true of lack of popularity. Another conclusion drawn by the author is that the observations of House-masters regarding grouping were, on the whole, reasonably accurate. While our general impression from Mr. Rose's pioneer research may be rather negative, it has to be borne in mind that the study of group structure, group leadership and, more generally, group behaviour in institutions of this kind is still in its infancy. For this reason, studies such as the present deserve further encouragement. Results of any real practical value to the administrator can be expected from them only if they are carried out on a larger scale, in institutions of different types, and repeated at suitable intervals.

As will be seen from Dr. Peter Scott's detailed report, the problem of the defective offender engaged the deliberations of a Royal Commission. These deliberations showed at how many levels of legal action and medical diagnosis the issue can be studied, and how each level presents difficulties in diagnosis and procedure. Broadly considered, the problem is concerned with age factors, the implications of intelligence levels, the classification of types for disposal and custodianship, and lastly, the apparently unclassifiable issue of the so-called psychopath. We must plead ignorance as psychiatrists and, as Scott says, admit that the problem of the psychopath has so many social determinants that it is only in part a psychological issue. It is important that psychiatrists should display scientific humility in the face of some of these vexing problems, for they would be unwise to distribute labels which can be too adhesive. As some psychopaths are a nuisance and some a danger, and yet a limited number are even creative social misfits, we must be scrupulous not to create too fine-cut definitions out of the welter of human variability. As one magistrate wisely said, we want guidance, not definition; particular case studies in terms of traits of dangerous import will be of greater value to lawyers than categorical diagnosis.

VIOLENT CRUELTY TO CHILDREN

BY T. C. N. GIBBENS AND A. WALKER (LONDON)

In 1952 as a result of conversations between Miss Margery Fry and the Chairman of the Prison Commission, a register was begun of all cases sentenced to imprisonment for cruelty to children involving violence. In 1953 one of the authors (T. C. N. G.) undertook to make a clinical examination of these offenders. As many as possible of those sent to prison between October 1953 and October 1954 and notified by prison governors to the Commission were interviewed in twenty prisons up and down the country. This is apparently the first time an attempt has been made by one person to examine in this way all those convicted of a certain offence during a period of time.

Thirty-two men and seven women were interviewed. During the year a total of thirty-two men and five women convicted of cruelty with violence were notified, but seven of them with very short sentences were not notified in time to be seen before discharge or were missed for some other reason. On the other hand, seven men and two women who were convicted the year before were seen. It is not possible to be certain that all cases were notified but there can be no doubt that this was done in the great majority of cases.

Every effort was made to obtain as much information as possible about the offenders. The N.S.P.C.C. generously supported the investigation and supplied all the information in their possession. As far as possible the original case files were examined whenever a prisoner had been on probation, in an approved school or a Borstal, or in a hospital. The Children's Officers were approached in each case and took the greatest pains to supply information and to answer a number of questions about the injured children in their care. Psychological tests were given by prison psychologists. In some cases the prisoner's general practitioner supplied valuable information. One of the disadvantages of studying a scattered population was that home visits could rarely be made: a psychiatric social worker on the Prison Commission's staff made four home visits and visits were made in eight other cases by one of the authors (A. Walker).

The Men. The sentences given to the cases seen, and to the annual sample, were as follows:

	<i>Cases Seen</i>	<i>Annual Sample</i>
2-6 months . . .	17	24
1-4 years . . .	8	6
More than 5 years .	7	2
	32	32

It will be seen that the annual sample tended to commit a milder type of offence and that the data which follow refer to exceptionally severe cases of cruelty.

Perhaps the most significant feature of these cases is that the total number is so small. Even if one supposed that only half the cases were reported, the total would only equal about half the number of murders occurring in a year. This was during a time when newspapers and responsible people were commenting upon the disturbing increase in cases of cruelty. Cruelty by neglect is, of course, much commoner.

Age. More than half the group were young fathers of a small family.

Under 20 . . .	1
20-30 . . .	17
30-40 . . .	8
40-50 . . .	5
50+ . . .	1

Family History. There was a family history of mental abnormality in nearly a third of the group (nine cases). Psychosis was less in evidence than mental deficiency in a sibling (four cases) or alcoholism with marked instability in the father (five cases); but full information was often not available about the fathers of these prisoners. Five of the parents had criminal records.

One of the main objects of the survey was to discover how frequently these cruel fathers had been subjected to cruelty during their own childhood. It was difficult to investigate this point thoroughly; but two of the parents had been known to the N.S.P.C.C. during the prisoner's childhood and had been prosecuted. On the whole, as we shall see, physical cruelty does not breed cruelty, though it may sometimes do so: it is rejection, indifference and hostility which produce the cruel parent.

Early Environment. The infancy and childhood of these cases were much more frequently disturbed than is the case with the majority of offenders. Six were illegitimate—a rate about four times as high as in the general

population and twice as high as in most samples of delinquents. Nine cases—nearly a third—were separated from their father from birth, usually did not know who he was, and had a very ineffective or late father-substitute: another seven had limited contact with their father, three not seeing him after the age of seven, and others at infrequent intervals.

Separation from the mother before the age of two occurred in five cases and before ten in two others. Three mothers died soon after childbirth, the other two reappeared often enough to emphasize their indifference. Such flagrant abandonment, of course, may have severe consequences even when it occurs in later childhood. One man still takes his mother for his sister. In spite of such disordered home life, only three were brought up mainly in institutions, and in only one case from an early age. The loss of a father induces a close relationship with the mother. It was notable that in five cases the men had stayed at home till twenty-five or thirty, longer than is usual for people of this social status.

Most of the men came from large families. Apart from three illegitimate men who had no known family, the average number in siblings was six. The mother of one man had had eighteen children of her own, and had also brought up two orphans of a neighbour as an act of kindness. With so much disturbance of family life, there was naturally little evidence of family loyalty. Nearly half were either ignorant of their siblings' whereabouts, indifferent or actively hostile to them.

School. Adjustment at school varied widely according to talent and background, but a quarter (eight cases), including most of the seriously aggressive offenders, had a history of marked truancy and even of complete rebellion against school life in any form.

Work. The employment record of these men showed an unusual degree of variation. A quarter (seven cases) had unusually good records of hard and regular work. Aggressive alcoholic offenders may be hard-drinking but they are often equally hard-working, throwing up their jobs fairly often but being taken on by old employers, and having practically no unemployment. At the other extreme there was a quarter (eight cases) whose employment records were virtually non-existent. In most cases this was associated with a pathological mental condition but one or two were happily adjusted to unemployment and rang the changes on various forms of relief with surprising ingenuity. There are few conditions so baffling as a total unwillingness to work existing without other abnormality.

The most interesting and certainly a significant fact was that no less than a quarter (eight cases) were or had been regular soldiers or sailors for a substantial period. Reference will be made to this later. Apart from these, ten cases had been prematurely discharged from the services for one reason

or another and four had had stormy careers or repeated AWOL's and disciplinary offences. Seven had fairly good records.

Mental and Physical Health. There was a great deal of mental ill-health in the group. One was schizophrenic when interviewed and one developed a psychosis some months after being seen. Four others had had mental hospital treatment, two for attacks of schizophrenia, which were proved by the inspection of records, and two for suicidal illnesses or attempts. Another five had had symptoms of psychiatric significance before conviction: severe stammers (three), sleepwalking, blackouts, palpitations and hypochondriacal complaints, to say nothing of cases discharged from the army on psychiatric grounds or who had minor or transitory symptoms. One was considered genuinely epileptic.

More surprising was the extent of physical ill-health. A third of the group had a history of some important physical condition. Two were invalids with tuberculosis and two had been off work for some time with major attacks of it. Other individuals had histories of pneumonectomy, of four years' hospitalization for fractured spine, of cleft palate with blocked tear duct resulting in recurrent eczema of the face causing unemployment, of post-concussive headaches, and bilateral deafness which accentuated paranoid trends. Three of the chronically unemployed complained of recurrent bronchitis, but there was so little evidence for this that they were considered to be malingerers.

Criminal Records. Only a quarter had no previous convictions, although in five other cases the offences had involved only fines or probation.

Convictions

Nil . . .	8
1-2 . . .	10
3-5 . . .	6
5-10 . . .	4
Over 10 . . .	4

The main interest lay in six cases who had a well-marked history of aggressive offences. Four of these had a long history of serious aggressive offences as well as eight or ten minor convictions for being drunk or disorderly, assaulting the police, etc., which were not individually recorded. In two cases the history was virtually limited to aggressive offences. There was only one chronic acquisitive recidivist—an amiable old lag with twelve serious convictions for shop-breaking who had incurred two periods of penal servitude, and whom one would have supposed incapable of cruelty. The offence was, in fact, a minor one.

Alcohol. Though a very important factor, drunkenness played a lesser part in these offences than expected. In a third, including most of those classed as passive-inadequate, there was no question of drink having played any part in the offence. A further third were fairly regular drinkers, but did not seem to have been particularly drunk at the time, and in three cases the offence was very impulsive and might not have occurred if the prisoner had not been seriously drunk at the time.

Intelligence. Levels of intelligence had to be interpreted broadly since it was not possible to give the same tests to all subjects. Comparison with Twistleton's¹ study of female neglectful offenders showed that there was little difference in intelligence levels except that his group contained more defectives, and also more borderline cases (28·3 per cent. below I.Q. 80 compared with 23 per cent. of the violent group). Intellectual dullness plays a considerable part in violent as well as neglectful cruelty.

<i>I.Q.</i>	<i>Gibbens</i>		<i>Twistleton</i>	
	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>%</i>
Less than 70	1	3·1	6	10·0
70-90 .	17	53·1	23	38·3
90-110 .	11	34·4	28	46·7
Over 110 .	3	9·4	3	5·0
	32	100·0	60	100·0

The Wives. Cruelty, even of the violent type, tends to spring from the relationship of both parents and is rarely attributable to any isolated action on the part of the man. In eight instances the wife was convicted at the same time as her husband, though usually for neglect and ill-treatment rather than violence. Because of this, and the shorter sentences given to women, only one pair were examined. A third of the wives (eleven), including those who were convicted, were certainly quite incompetent, as judged by the report of the N.S.P.C.C. or Children's Officers, so that it was difficult to apportion the blame for the gradual break-up of home circumstances which preceded the crime. Another twelve were almost certainly thoroughly inefficient although this could not be fully corroborated. Only seven wives appeared to be normally competent; in two cases it was the death of a capable wife which precipitated the circumstances leading to cruelty. With regard to the

¹ TWISTLETON. Report of the Psychological Section of the British Association Meeting, September, 1954.

future there were many threats of divorce and separations, but there was every indication that nine of the marriages would go on as before when the prisoner was released and in the majority of the rest it was thought likely that a reconciliation would be effected. The prisoner was often anxious and uncertain about the outcome of the marriage and the services of a social worker would have been valuable in helping to prepare for the man's release and resettlement.

The Offence. Eighteen of the prisoners were charged with assault and ill-treatment, and two with neglect, under the Children's and Young Persons Act. The remainder were charged with general offences, five with grievous bodily harm, three with common assault, four with manslaughter and one was convicted of murder, later reduced to manslaughter on appeal. The two cases of neglect were included because one had a previous record of violent cruelty and the other neglected the child until he died. In the main group there was much similarity between the various offences, but some lay on the periphery of what is normally thought of as cruelty to children.

With these exceptions the assaults, by belt, foot or fist, usually had a similar background. With the younger children it was usually the child's persistently wet and dirty habits which infuriated the father, or sometimes his incessant crying. Fairly often it was 'not his child, anyway' or the pregnancy had led to a forced marriage. In the older group of children, the offensive behaviour was usually defiant disobedience, especially stealing food, which exasperated the father. Usually he felt that he had never established his authority and that the child had been allowed to run wild during his absence in the services or in prison.

Most of the offences involved serious violence, but could be regarded as a final outburst at the end of a long period of increasing tension. In twelve cases the offender had shown persistently aggressive tendencies, striking the child on many occasions and hitting his wife as often as he did the child: in the remainder it was an almost isolated act. A few of the crimes, however, involved a scarcely credible degree of cruelty. Usually such parents had a pathological mental condition but sometimes a physical defect in the child seemed to cause a revulsion of feeling in the parents. Altogether six children died as a result of their injuries.

Consideration was given to the possible influence of starvation and other physical factors immediately preceding the crime upon the mental state of the prisoner, but there was little to suggest that these factors were of much importance, except in the case of alcohol. One epileptic defective was admitted to prison with quite marked malnutrition.

The Children. Children of all ages were attacked. A third were aged three or less, a third were over ten, and the others scattered between these

ages. Some indication of the matrimonial turmoil is provided by the fact that three of the children were the illegitimate sons of the father, and in eight other cases the father was not the natural father of the child—being a step-father officially or unofficially in four cases, and in five denying paternity of this particular child of the marriage. In five instances the offender was not *in loco parentis* to the child.

Half the children were committed to the care of the local authority: the remainder of the survivors stayed with the mother. Usually the family consisted of two or three children, but in seven cases there were at least six siblings and the parental pattern of large families was found to repeat itself.

The children showed a great deal of behaviour disturbance before the offence. Three were abnormal—with congenital heart disease, epilepsy with mental deficiency and backwardness with hare-lip; three had been before the juvenile courts for stealing. Altogether half the children (fifteen) showed well-marked disturbance which was no doubt caused by the very unstable background and the continuous quarrelling of the parents, but nevertheless resulted in thoroughly exasperating behaviour, sometimes suggesting a situation which called for child guidance treatment rather than purely social measures. The remainder were either normally naughty and excessively chastised by a drunken father, or were normally behaved for their age (e.g. wet or dirty) but had parents who were exasperated either because they were particularly sensitive to this behaviour or had not experienced it with the other children and regarded it as quite exceptional and 'deliberate'. One psychopathic father was so incensed to discover that his son aged five was masturbating that he considered himself justified in using any degree of violence to stop it.

The behaviour disturbances exhibited by these children varied widely. As one would imagine, the immediate consequence of the cruelty seemed much less important than the general effects of the sort of upbringing the children had received. It was interesting to find that in several instances the most disturbed child was not the one who had been cruelly treated. The immediate consequences, of which nightmares were the commonest, tended to pass off quickly. A tendency to wake early or to sleep very little was widespread. It was a feature, of course, which had been particularly exasperating to the parents. The most marked disturbances occurred in the older children of five or more, who were frequently aggressive, resentful and bullying. It was usually several months before much improvement was noted.

The most interesting group from the psychiatric standpoint was the eight cases in which there was an obvious discrepancy between the endowment of the child and its parents. Here it was obviously not only a question

of a cruel parent and his victim but of a bewildered parent struggling with a disturbed child, and the situation called for mutual explanation and adjustment of the sort provided by the child guidance clinic.

The Diagnosis. The offenders offered a fairly wide range of personalities and problems. They were divided into the groups shown in Table I, according to the predominant features, but many could reasonably have been placed in other groups, *e.g.* one of the dullards was also alcoholic and aggressive. The most marked clinical division, apart from the question of mental illness, was between those who were persistently aggressive and those who, though deeply aggressive, did not show any external expression of it until the final act of cruelty. But this division does not always apply to the whole personality: one of the problems which often besets persistently aggressive offenders is that they are unduly passive or inhibited in the sexual sphere.

TABLE I

	<i>Diagnosis</i>	<i>Men</i>	<i>Women</i>
<i>Mentally abnormal</i> 11	Schizophrenia	1	1
	Mental defective . . .	1	1
	Psychopaths	4	2
	Borderline psychopaths .	3	—
	Neurotic	2	—
<i>Normal</i> 21	Alcoholic aggressive . .	3	—
	Severely unstable . . .	6	1
	Passive-inadequate . . .	6	2
	Dullards	3	—
	Normal	3	—
		32	7

Only one man was schizophrenic at the time of the interview, though one defective subsequently developed a psychosis and was certified insane. The one psychotic woman was severely psychopathic at the time of the interview and developed a psychosis some months later.

The term psychopath was here used only for cases whose mental abnormality was beyond question. All had had mental hospital treatment. Two had had attacks of schizophrenia and the diagnosis was really that of a schizophrenic defect state. The psychopathy in the other two was the end product of severe chronic neurosis. The three borderline psychopaths satisfied most of the criteria for the diagnosis of aggressive psychopathy and had been discharged from the army with this diagnosis. All were

chronic offenders with very poor prognosis. The alcoholic aggressives were lesser, or perhaps earlier, versions of the same type. All showed persistent aggressiveness, but there had often been strong environmental pressure to bring about their condition.

The severely unstable were nearly as aggressive as the foregoing and sometimes heavy drinkers, but their main characteristic was that they had all been rejected or illegitimate children who had come some way to establishing themselves. Their objectives were often good and for a time they could work well, but restlessness, or some aggressive outburst or period of drinking, would spoil what they had achieved. After an unsuitable marriage they rapidly deteriorated. Many were regular service men.

The passive inadequates were much less overtly aggressive. They were solitary, incompetent men who were picked for a husband by women older than themselves, who dominated them. Their children tended to be defiant and out of control and they released much pent-up aggression upon them in order to maintain their control. Only one man was of defective level of intelligence but in the dullards an intelligence quotient of about 70 played its part in their inadequacy. One was an aggressive alcoholic.

It will be remembered that in about half the cases (fifteen) home life was broken before adolescence and indeed, apart from two cases whose fathers died at twelve, during childhood. Those with mental abnormality came from a variety of backgrounds, but it was among the mentally normal but unstable, from deprived backgrounds, that were found the eight regular soldiers who came nearest to forming a characteristic pattern on the genesis of violent cruelty. It was no accident, of course, that there was this concentration in the army. The paradigm of such careers was as follows: The man is in his late twenties. He never knew his father, or he deserted in his infancy. A year or two afterwards his mother put him in a home or left him with a grandmother who died. Disturbed behaviour followed, but he proved amenable to strict discipline and when sent to an approved school for delinquency he responded rather well and became leader in the cadet corps. If tried in outside employment he was truculent and unsuitable, but he joined the regular army and there got on well, responding to the strict discipline, hitting out at it but bearing no malice when it hit back. During adolescence there was sexual inhibition, the suppression of masturbation, and much guilt which led him to buy muscle-developing springs and go for long runs. In the army he took up boxing and was a good athlete. Sometimes he became a P.T. instructor or joined the commandos or paratroops, but he had little interest in girls, and his friends chaffed him for backwardness. He liked the company of men 'whom he can talk to' and thought that sexual activity weakened a man's sporting prowess. The time came to leave the army and he never

ceased to regret it. He was seduced by a woman whom he met in a public house, and married her when she said she was pregnant, though this might turn out to be untrue, or she told him he was not the father, or that she had an illegitimate child with her mother. He heard that she had always had a bad reputation. She was an incompetent housewife, always wanting to be out, unable to make money last, the sort of woman who would 'cut off a sleeve rather than mend the elbow'. They found some adjustment by going out drinking together, and his work suffered. He started hitting her, but this made things worse since she dare not tell him that the rent or hire purchase money had been spent on housekeeping for weeks past and she ran away when he heard of it. Moves to cheaper accommodation, drunkenness, unemployment and quarrels followed. The N.S.P.C.C. visited the home, but the children were never undernourished or badly clothed, and the case was closed. Six months later he struck the oldest child violently because he messed himself half an hour after he was potted and changed.

Such are the better adjusted members of the group. Others are more unstable and more delinquent. But by whatever route they reach this point, the story of the marriage is nearly always the same. In only two instances a good wife was driven away by the persistent violence and drunkenness of a continuously aggressive husband.

The Women. Seven women were convicted of violent cruelty. They differed from the men in being more frequently abnormal and in having little in common in personality or the background or type of offence. The offences were more serious—three were charged under the Children's Act, but three were convicted of grievous bodily harm and one was convicted of murder. Three had well-marked psychopathic personalities and one of three developed schizophrenia some months after being interviewed. One was a remarkably efficient and conscientious mother with an I.Q. of 59 who became quite unnerved when her youngest child proved difficult to manage, and committed an assault which showed much defect of judgment rather than ill-will. One was a woman of good character who had suffered for some years from Graves' disease of increasing severity. She refused operation and ultimately assaulted an adolescent in an outburst of irritation. Her responsibility for the offence was probably limited. In prison she was operated upon and made an excellent recovery, although she remained irritable and emotional.

The women tended to be somewhat older than the men, four of them being twenty-nine and over, and four had an I.Q. of 80 or less. Two were illegitimate, and had never known their fathers, and had been separated from their mothers when less than three years old. Three others had lost their fathers at eight or less.

E.E.G. Examination. There were considerable administrative difficulties in securing electroencephalographic examination in all cases, and many who were serving short sentences in local prisons were not available long enough for arrangements to be made. The Prison Commission, however, went to some trouble to secure an E.E.G. in the more serious cases. Four men refused examination: results were ultimately available in sixteen cases and five of these showed abnormality. Three showed marked abnormality—the woman with Graves' disease, a female psychopath and a man diagnosed clinically as alcoholic-aggressive and not regarded as a psychopath. One neurotic and one defective who later became psychotic had mildly abnormal records. This is a relatively high rate of abnormality.

Social Factors. It might be supposed from this description that these offences always occurred in conditions of destitution. This was not usually the case. Three families were in problem family conditions of destitution and were under continuous N.S.P.C.C. and other social agency care, and nine others lived in conditions of more than usual poverty, overcrowding or inconvenience. But seven were living in reasonably satisfactory conditions and eight were in quite adequate, or sometimes even good working-class, conditions.

A particularly interesting group among the latter was one of five families who had been satisfactorily rehoused before the offence occurred. The new council house may rapidly sink to the condition of the slums, but there is usually some sign that the spirit of betterment has been roused. It has been suggested, and we think rightly, that such rehousing imposes the social burden of keeping up appearances in the new neighbourhood. Violence may follow the appearance of a child in a juvenile court, and harsh criticism by neighbours. Certainly there is no place for a naive belief that improved material conditions are all that is required to resettle such families.

There is, however, another reason why the breaking point sometimes comes after rather than before rehousing. During the period of homeless wandering, rehousing seems to offer a solution to all their troubles: when it is achieved, the couple is faced with the recognition that their own inefficiency and personality defects are still with them, that the husband still does not work and the wife is still a bad manager. Recriminations are then redoubled and the child who continues to make messes on the new stairs is apt to bear the brunt of their violence.

The final outstanding group is composed of five families who were perpetually wandering. These extremely complicated cases defy case work by remaining on the move. The main trouble seems to be that the marriage starts to break up before the family had been housed at all, also partly because married life has been spent with 'in-laws'. The children are taken

into care; this unsettles them and makes them more difficult to manage when they return. Several parents complained that their children came home wet and dirty, but had gone away quite clean. Usually this was untrue: there had been a relapse on return home, due to the change and strained relations of the parents. Several fathers were exasperated because their children did not recognize them and refused to call them 'daddy'; one little boy called his mother 'nurse' for weeks after his return home. Seven of the children cruelly treated had previously been under local authority care.

Psychological Factors. An inquiry based upon a single fairly lengthy interview is clearly unlikely to provide more than some general hints about what may be the dynamic factors tending to produce cruelty to children. The problems are those of the origin of aggressiveness in general, with the difference that aggressive crimes are common, but violent cruelty to children very much less common. It is the most repellent form of violence, perhaps because it is in general the most cowardly. In the inadequate group indeed it was easy to see that the offender poured out on the defenceless child a violence which he had been unable to express against his wife. But in half of the cases which showed persistent aggressiveness the wives were quite often knocked about, in several cases rather more than the children.

We have seen that in nearly half this group home life was disturbed, most often by the serious lack of paternal influence, or nearly as often by the absence of both parents. It was naturally difficult to obtain a clear picture of the prisoner's parents, especially since in psychopathic offenders a fragmentation or complete incoherence of attitude to the parents is such a common finding, but those without fathers had mothers who seemed to be vigorous, efficient women, perhaps supporting a large family by their own exertions, affectionate but 'standing no nonsense' and meting out punishments vigorously.

As with most persistently aggressive offenders, sexual development was commonly disturbed. No less than ten cases vigorously denied any masturbation, even transient: this was not because sexual intercourse had replaced it; usually there had been 'little interest' in women till much later, when they were seized by a more experienced and promiscuous woman. Such histories are not uncommon amongst aggressive offenders in general, but they cannot be called characteristic. It is, for instance, common to find quite early and promiscuous activity. There were one or two histories of this kind among the cruelty cases but they were obtained in those who had carried out relatively pointless attacks on children who were not related to them. The cruel fathers have no recollection of a man who could have provided some model of paternal behaviour, and the relation to their

mothers is such that later sexual relations tend to release an unmanageable aggression.

There were three or four cases in which it was quite clear that sexual maladjustment in a narrower sense had played an important part in the final breakdown. Two very similar young men produced a curious history that the violence had been preceded by a few weeks of sexual hyperactivity in each case with the half-conscious intention of healing the breach in the marriage.

The second strand which ran through these cases was that these men were in general concerned for their children. It is after all common enough for offenders to show little or no interest in their children, but that was not the case here. Their exasperation with their wives for the neglect and with their children for delayed development and disobedience had a very positive quality. There were several instances in which deteriorated and chronic offenders clung to their children when their wives deserted, and fought for them with their relations and their wives. They might beat them or starve them, but considering the shallowness and instability of their other relationships, they deserted them much less than their own parents had deserted them. This feeling seemed at times to take on an almost maternal quality. The most marked 'maternalization' was in fact in the husband of an exceedingly cruel woman: he bathed the child frequently, fussed over its food and clothing, and tormented his wife by his angry denunciations if the child failed to gain the correct amount of weight each week. Many of the cruel fathers showed much family concern. One young man married a widow with seven children, two of them illegitimate. Reason made him hesitate, but he undertook the duties of father with quite misguided but well-meaning enthusiasm. His mother had been in very similar circumstances in his youth. Two fathers gave up work and stayed at home to look after the children. In some cases the concern took on a different complexion. One psychopathic offender was incensed to discover that his little child was masturbating and elaborated a number of ill-founded accusations about a neighbour interfering with his child. Another case was deeply resentful that he had not been allowed to attend his wife's first confinements: he was present at the last confinement and felt that his understanding of this child was much better than of the others. In yet another case the cruelty was associated with overt incest: the offender insisted that he had 'borne his children as much as his wife had' since he felt ill throughout all her numerous pregnancies and even knew when she was about to have a period because he developed a headache and rheumatism. It seems that there is a gradation between strong emotional concern and overtly sexualized interest.

An interpretation of these histories is made more difficult by a number of cultural problems. Nearly a third (ten) said they were Roman Catholics, which is doubtless connected with the fact that they came from large families. Three were Irish immigrants and three of Irish extraction. Any one who sees many adult offenders knows that the social, sexual and criminal history of Irish immigrants is often very different from that of their English contemporaries; they are more strictly reared; when they come to England they have greater expectations; and in their isolation they encourage themselves to throw off their own cultural restraints and may deteriorate rapidly, though often with a greater sense of despair and irritation. It has already been noted that the violence usually had some precipitating circumstance of which the commonest was being wet and dirty, not recognizing the parent on return from being boarded out, defying the father's authority and stealing food; with the question of illegitimacy as a constant source of hostility. These would, of course, be sometimes irritating to any parent, but it was often clear that the parents were particularly sensitive. One man was incensed by the child's masturbation, but not by its dirty habits. A woman of very dull intelligence (I.Q. 59), brought up by a dominating grandmother to be extremely clean, in childhood and later, proved to be an efficient and conscientious housewife. She was devoted to her children but quite unnerved when one of them was normally slow in learning clean habits.

One important question was whether these attacks were frankly sadistic. Sadism is best limited to cases in which sexual emotion or satisfaction consciously accompanies an act of violence. There were no instances of a prisoner admitting such feeling. But it is sometimes possible to infer, though not with certainty, from the general circumstances and background of the case, that there has been an important sadistic element. Three of the group were motivated in this way, one of them a youth who injured his little brother after plotting for some days to be alone with him; some months after release from prison he committed suicide. In many others, *e.g.* among the soldiers, highly socialized forms of sado-masochistic attitudes can be seen, if one extends definitions more widely.

Notification. The procedure followed in dealing with these acts of cruelty varied widely. In nearly half these acts (fifteen), including all those more serious offences which were dealt with outside the Children's and Young Persons Act, the police dealt with the case entirely. It is significant, however, that the N.S.P.C.C. were familiar with nine of these families, though the period of visiting had sometimes been several years before the offence.

In the remaining seventeen cases, including all but one of the lesser offences under the Children's and Young Persons Act, the police and the

N.S.P.C.C. were usually involved. In two cases the N.S.P.C.C. took the initiative entirely where a father was under supervision and had defied warnings and advice; in four others the complaint (often from medical practitioners or welfare workers) was made only to the N.S.P.C.C. who investigated and started proceedings. In the other eleven the police, or sometimes both the police and the N.S.P.C.C., were informed in the first place and proceeded jointly; or occasionally the conduct of affairs was left to the N.S.P.C.C. Again, ten of the families were already known to the N.S.P.C.C., making a total of nineteen, or nearly two-thirds of the group. In the majority the help of the N.S.P.C.C. had been sought by the parents in the past, or there had been visits because of complaints of alleged cruelty. These families, as we saw, are usually above the level at which child neglect is evident; the children are reasonably well-fed and clothed: after a time the wife assures the inspector that she is getting on much better with her husband and the case is closed. There were only three or four cases in which violent cruelty grew out of a background of pronounced neglect and incompetence of the sort which requires continuous supervision by several social agencies, and which had already been notified.

The commonest form of notification was for a mother to take her injured child to the police station. This accounted for half the cases; the others were notified by strangers or neighbours, doctors, health workers or school teachers.

Discussion. There are some conclusions which are the immediate concern of the psychiatrist. Mental abnormality in a parent is usually, and quite rightly, regarded as an extenuating factor calling for more tolerant and patient management. Yet psychiatric examination would show, in some cases, that the type of abnormality made the outlook very much worse and called for either temporary removal of the children or the permanent supervision of the family. There is a tendency for laymen to interpret all forms of mental abnormality in the same way. Advice of this kind was never sought in any of the male cases. If probation were more frequently used, out-patient observation and treatment could be required as a condition.

Secondly, the degree of disturbance in the children varies widely. In younger children who have been the victims of isolated and impulsive violence, it may apparently be transitory; though, even here, as we have seen, some mental or physical defect in the child may partly explain the parent's attitude. In the older children, however, years of mismanagement may have caused a maladjustment which will remain a problem for some time, whether or not there is an improvement in the parent's behaviour. Child guidance treatment may be necessary to reduce the provoking behaviour and help the parent to understand it.

Full social and, if necessary, psychiatric examination would allow courts to consider the needs of the family as a whole. It would be an advantage if all cases were remanded for investigation before a decision is made. The defective but obsessively clean and conscientious mother who injured her child when beside herself with anxiety about a normal degree of incontinence did more physical damage to the child than the psychopathically aggressive mother who persistently hit or burnt her children; but the equal prison sentences they received took no account of the fact that the outlook for the children was entirely favourable in the first case and unfavourable in the second. Remand for investigation of parent and child would also give time for animosity and publicity to subside before a decision is made. This might allow a number of the less serious offenders to be put on probation, which from the point of view of the child's interests and the rehabilitation of the parent seems a very suitable form of control. Short sentences of imprisonment do not provide the prolonged supervision which is necessary and may help to break up a marriage which has many hopeful features. The N.S.P.C.C. may continue to visit but the situation may have become more complex—the defiant child who has succeeded in sending his father to prison for a few months faces a difficult situation on his return.

This small series of cases of violent cruelty does not allow one to draw conclusions about the general management of cruelty to children, especially of the much commoner and rather different form of cruelty by neglect, but some of the similarities and differences may be considered.

It is nowadays accepted that cruelty to children cannot be adequately dealt with by warnings and punishments, but calls for concentrated and skilled social work, directed often towards the whole family. The N.S.P.C.C. has recognized this by appointing women visitors to take over the day-to-day care of families who need this sort of continuous help, though this applies to the neglectful rather than to the potentially violent parents. There were several instances of families who received help for three or four years, the N.S.P.C.C. helping to obtain assistance from many social agencies with unflagging care. And there were others in which agents of the local authorities or Family Service Units had done the same. This work had usually been successful until some sudden change in the circumstances, such as the release of the father from prison, had introduced a new and unmanageable factor. These violent parents need concentrated social work just as much as the neglectful ones, although the method of work will be rather different. There was much to suggest that, apart from some pathological cases, most of them would have become less irritable and exasperated if their wives had been helped to become more competent, and if they had felt that rapid social deterioration had been halted.

Violent or neglectful parents are alike, too, in calling for a co-ordination of the many social agencies concerned, as Donnison² has described, and we agreed with his conclusion that the object might well be to allocate social work with the whole family to the individual social worker from any agency who appears most suitable in the circumstances. The extent to which this can really be carried out will vary according to the number and experience of the workers available; there are no doubt serious practical difficulties. In 1950 the Home Office and the Ministries of Health and Education took the initiative in recommending the formation of such co-ordinating committees and the great majority of the local authorities have followed the suggestion. It must be remembered that these were cases of relatively sudden and sporadic outbreaks of violence and necessarily give no indication of the extent of successful prevention effected by the local authorities. Perhaps the best indication of this is that there were so few cases to be seen in prison. Some of the large centres of population hardly contributed any cases at all, which suggests a high general level of child care. For it seems unlikely that there is any method of reducing such sporadic offences except by a general raising of the standard of the care of children. Much more, however, could be done in exchanging information between the agencies.

Violence differs from neglect, however, in two ways: the children are seldom ill-clothed, ill-fed and obviously neglected or in bad material circumstances; and the parents tend to be less co-operative. Once the threat of violence seems to have passed the general standards of the home do not attract attention and the case is closed. Yet it is probable that most families need social work for some time, once an accusation of cruelty has been accepted as justified, although the social work would need to pay more attention to psychological tensions than to material needs. It must be much more difficult for the agents of local authorities, who are hard pressed to give help to those who ask for it or are willing to accept it, to seek out and maintain contact with a family which shows few of the usual signs of neglect, does not wish to be disturbed and may even challenge the worker's right to visit. Those who deal with such families need some authority, however tactfully it is used, and need to have sufficient experience not to despair of working successfully with parents who are initially unco-operative. N.S.P.C.C. inspectors, and probation officers (if the case comes to court), have the advantage of either having authority or of being credited with it by the parents themselves; it should be added that many of these offenders, especially if they had struggled on for some time, spoke of them with respect and confidence as people who had helped them a great deal. This authority

² DONNISON, D. V. 'The Neglected Child and the Social Services.' Manchester University Press, 1954.

is most needed at the early stages of investigation of a complaint, but it is not so certain that long-term social work can be combined with the work of investigation. Co-ordinating committees might consider some division of the field into that of investigation and treatment. The N.S.P.C.C., owing to its special interest and because so many complaints are first made to it, is in a key position to make investigations and assessments in violent cases, although not alone in this. Once the case is notified, a number of other agencies become involved who are particularly well-equipped to carry out long-term supervision. If the first knowledge of the case leads to a court appearance, it may still be possible to provide the necessary supervision by placing the offender or his wife on probation for up to three years.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was carried out with the help of a grant from the Research Fund of the Institute of Psychiatry. We are grateful to Miss Margery Fry, the Howard League, and the I.S.T.D. for their initial help, and to the Prison Commissioners for permission to publish the paper; but permission does not imply that it represents their views. We should like to express our gratitude especially to Dr. Snell and Mrs. Crawley at the Prison Commission, to the N.S.P.C.C. and many Children's Officers, Prison Governors, Medical Officers and psychologists, as well as members of the probation and after-care services without whose help the investigation could not have been made.

SPECIAL NUMBER ON JUVENILE COURTS

In view of the forthcoming appointment of a Departmental Committee on Juvenile Courts, recently announced by the Home Secretary, the Editors are planning a special issue on the subject for publication probably in October 1956. Readers who wish to contribute material or suggestions to this number are asked to submit them at their earliest convenience.

STAFF STRAIN IN INSTITUTIONS¹

By PAUL DE BERKER (LONDON)

At any large gathering of those who deal directly with the socially maladjusted in institutions, it is possible to discern a note of anxiety and an urgent demand for guidance from an authority which is, by implication, omniscient. This seems to spring from the interplay of social pressures upon the individual personalities of those who bear direct responsibility for the maladjusted and who, as it were, are in the front line to absorb the shock of aberrant behaviour upon the community.

Our penal methods are still in a state of flux. The formula 'punishment, exhortation, example' is being progressively leavened with the ingredient 'understanding'. This means that more and more responsibility must be thrown individually upon those who run our institutions, since they will have to perceive the separate needs of each of their inmates and consider them relative to the needs of the community as a whole.

With emphasis towards understanding, a further difficulty for the individual arises. Society, as Mr. Justice Stephen maintains, has the moral right to hate the criminal; and indeed there is a great welling up of spontaneous hatred for those who affront Society's demands. This hatred is to some extent expressed in our legal system which tries and condemns, and our prisons which punish. If 'pure' punishment becomes reprehensible and rehabilitation increasingly more desirable, what then shall we do with our hate? The problem for those who work directly with the criminal or with the socially maladjusted becomes even more acute. They bear provocation face to face and also, latent within the systems they administer, is the means to retaliate by punishment and deprivation of the offender.

This problem has arisen in fields other than that of delinquency. The staff of the Northfield experiment, who were attempting social rehabilitation of war-time emotional casualties from the services, faced the same anxieties. The armed forces have a core of opinion which tends towards

¹ I am grateful to H.M. Prison Commissioners for permission to publish this article. It does not in any way necessarily represent their views.

punitive treatment of the 'neurotic'. The staff at the Northfield, however, felt that the patients were victims of strains which they, the staff, personally experienced also but dealt with successfully. The staff's feelings were further complicated by their status of non-combatants engaged in sending others back to combatant areas. Punitive measures and 'compulsion' could be one type of reaction to these difficulties (since we all tend to blame and punish ourselves for what we consider to be our weaknesses), but clearly such reactions were not likely to be successful with the patients. Some sort of therapy was needed which would lead the patients and the staff to face their anxieties and to come to terms with them. As the Northfield staff faced the anxieties of their patients, so to some degree they faced their own. A further complicating factor arose out of the inevitable setbacks, failures and partial successes which occur in any venture of this sort. Failure on the part of the patient, it is felt, may come to mean the personal failure of the exponent of the system, which in turn tends to reinforce the claims of any alternative system and which can spontaneously evoke blame and punishment.

Failure means that an individual, in whom there has been emotional investment, has not managed to live up to expectations. In other terms it means that he has rejected the help—that is to say, the love—of his mentor. To be rejected stirs hate. It also brings a loss of face in the eyes of the world. In other words the mentor has been 'let down'. The phrase contained in so many probation and approved school reports on their failures comes to mind: 'Fails to profit from help and advice, now needs strict discipline and training.' Does he need the punishment implied in 'strict discipline and training' or does it relieve our feelings to prescribe it for him?

Thus it may happen that a member of the staff, convinced that understanding, guidance and the individual approach is the sovereign treatment, finds that his own feelings are leading him in another direction and he must suffer in such a conflict which will reflect in his behaviour. The conflict will be even greater when amongst the staff will be members who have intellectually the so-called 'progressive' approach, whilst remaining emotionally attached to the 'punitive'. 'It is easier to take bars away from our prisons than away from the outlook of some of our staff.' In such cases the resulting behaviour can only be a compromise of outward forms clothing an inner austerity, the latter being reinforced by each failure which brings censure from the community which the institution serves.

There is a further factor at work producing stress in institutional staff. Prolonged buffeting by the inevitable anxieties aroused by dealing with aberrant social behaviour, which threatens both the larger community and the more immediate community of the institution, must, if these anxieties are

not adequately dealt with, produce defensive reaction against them. The most dangerous of these defences is apathy and its concomitant the production of stereotype formulæ to meet the difficulties.

This is dangerous for the individual since it does not in any way solve his problems but transfers them to another sphere. His apathy can to some extent insulate him from current conflicts and dull his perception of them. In this respect, of course, he is adopting the technique of some of his so-called 'institutionalized' charges who plod their way through his care. In the train of apathy inevitably comes the sense of failure and self blame. For the life of the institution it means that its living processes become hardened into ritual with a widening of the gap between the administering and the administered.

Having tentatively defined some aspects of the problem it seems very necessary to search for a solution, since if the trend towards 'understanding' continues and our punitive defensive resources become less countenanced, then the strain upon institutional staffs must become greater. The writer encountered these difficulties as a psychologist employed in a Ministry of Labour Industrial Rehabilitation Unit. This Unit dealt with men and women who were, or seemed as if they might become, chronically unemployed people, either by reason of a physical disability or, more largely, because of some socio-psychological condition which had led them to become cut off from their community and no longer able to enter into harmonious relationships with it. The Unit was situated in a northern town concerned mainly with heavy industry. The town's record of employer-employee relationships was no better and no worse than many others, but was such as to have engendered a culturally antagonistic attitude between employer and employee. The staff of the Unit, all drawn from the locality, who were to deal directly with the inmates, were of course in a supervisory rôle. They thus tended to take on many of the harsh attitudes that supervisors would have towards the usually inefficient wayward workers that many of the de-socialized rehabilitees tended to be. In fact they rejected them as the wider industrial community had rejected them. This tended to perpetuate the feelings of inferiority and aggression that many of the rehabilitees possessed and which kept them suspicious and isolated, constantly 'agin the boss'.

The therapeutic orientation of the Unit was derived from experience in Civilian Resettlement Units set up in the 1940s to deal with repatriated prisoners of war who had suffered emotional damage leading to suspicions, guilt and estrangement from their community. The Unit's purpose was to make its inmates feel part of a social community once more, as a preliminary to their taking their place in the wider community beyond. Its methods aimed

at recognizing the emotional barriers that existed and in enabling the inmates to come to terms with them. This process was combined with a physical regime to increase bodily vitality and a small amount of re-training in work and education skills, sometimes as a preliminary to wider training and also as a means of vocational guidance. There were about 100 non-residential inmates at any one time, and twelve staff dealing directly with them. A good deal of strain existed within this community. One source of this has already been mentioned, namely, the underlying punitive rejecting attitudes of the staff towards the inefficient and wayward workers that the majority of rehabilitees were. These attitudes, of course, were in conflict with the professed progressive philosophy of the Unit. In addition to this the Unit operated within a Government training centre and shared some services such as the canteen and paper administration with it. The training centre used traditional teaching methods with recourse to punishment and expulsion for the transgressors. There was a good deal of discussion, some antagonism and some division of loyalties between the respective staffs.

Strain also arose from the side of the rehabilitees. Many of them entered the Unit with well established culturally antagonistic attitudes towards any employing body, *i.e.* the Unit in this case. In addition there were negative feelings towards the Ministry of Labour and the tradition of the 'Buro' or Labour Exchange. Many did not believe in the good intentions of the Unit and muttered about 'slave camps' and so on. There were also personal negative feelings—a need to scapegoat and blame authority for their personal failure, inferiority feelings which made participation in any joint effort feared, and so on. Mixed with all this was a desire for change—vague hopes that something beneficial might happen and a factor which is difficult to describe adequately—perhaps 'latent energy' is the best available term. This was the driving force of the whole rehabilitation process; it expressed itself in numerous ways both positive and negative, in enthusiasm and in rebellion. For those in whom we could not evoke this fire we could do nothing. They came, they sat, and they departed.

There was also a sprinkling of more stable members drawn mostly from those who had been leading socially competent lives which had been interrupted by some physical calamity, such as a severe operation, amputation, partial blindness, etc., making them unable to follow their former occupation, and who needed some chance to reorientate themselves for a fresh start. These emotionally more mature people provided useful centres in the community for growth towards health. The technique for the exploration and resolution of the personal and social difficulties of the rehabilitees was one of group discussion, participation in the running of the Unit via committees, etc., and in general an attempt to produce an atmosphere of

maximum permissiveness in which the emotional barriers between the inmates and their community could be expressed and faced.

A community composed of people who are, in the main, socially sick, must very soon produce symptoms of that sickness within itself. A peculiarly explosive incident concerned the Unit newspaper, edited entirely by the rehabilitees headed by a highly intelligent, highly disturbed, anti-authority personality. The newspaper produced a scathing attack upon the chief instructor, scathing because of the acute observation of the telling points which went into it. The attack aroused the latent anxieties of the whole staff, many of whom, whilst giving lip service to the 'permissive' atmosphere, found difficulty in emotionally accepting it. All were of course particularly vulnerable to attack upon their authority since they dealt face to face with the rehabilitees in a superior rôle. It was soon apparent that unless the goodwill and active co-operation of the staff was united behind the theoretical orientation of the Unit, it would be impossible for work to continue on 'permissive' lines. Fortunately the tradition of joint consultation on Unit policy between all levels of the staff had been established from the outset and so the opportunity of discussing some of the present anxieties was available within the staff meeting group at which all members were present.

It is difficult to convey the atmosphere and proceedings of this group. To begin with, the dominant feelings expressed were anger and a demand that the offender should be punished or expelled. There were also feelings that those in authority did not appreciate the problems of the staff and that authority was weak and feared to be strong. The staff believed that they were being let down and left isolated. These were immediate reactions to the fears and anxieties that aberrant behaviour aroused. Individuals were aware of their own fears and other reactions but for the moment the group atmosphere seemed to them to be inappropriate to their expression. Indeed, the idea that they could be expressed did not occur to some members since expression may be interpreted as 'weakness'.

In the next phase members of the group perceived that they had liberty to express the 'weak feelings', and began to understand that all members shared them. In this group I initiated the entry to this phase by making known my own feelings of tension and failure over this particular problem. Others, but not all, then made similar contributions, either directly or indirectly. The group had now a whole lot of new attitudes open to it and some of its energy, previously directed to keeping these at bay, was available to explore other ways of dealing with the problem. As the group became less fearful it became less rigid and also, of course, members could now communicate more freely with each other, since the need to be defensive was relaxed. All this is a difficult process, since where anxieties exist there must

be defences against them. In order that the anxieties may be overcome the group must progressively demonstrate to its members that it is helpful and constructive, rather than oppressive and destructive.

The progress of a meeting of this sort depends a great deal upon the capacity of the leader to feel secure in the face of a crisis and to tolerate the emergence of 'weak' feelings. He must not feel driven towards authoritarian action since 'weak' feelings will deflect him from it. The second essential for progress is the existence of a member of the group who can open up the dangerous feelings, offering them, as it were, to the leader and to the group to deal with. Both these essential functions are a matter partly of personality and partly of the tradition and culture in which the group operates. In the Rehabilitation Unit we were fortunate in being a new organization with no very set forms of behaviour. We had the tradition of joint consultation which we adapted to our needs. The leader of the team, although in the authoritarian tradition, was sufficiently flexible to meet the very strong demands of the group for this form of discussion. These demands were not immediately apparent but very quickly emerged once the 'weak' feelings had been voiced from the floor, and the group experienced the relief from tension which came from this.

Obviously in a strongly authoritarian tradition with set forms of social behaviour between leader and members according to their position in the hierarchy, the progress of a discussion of this sort is much more difficult. Yet it is the decay of authoritarian systems within our penal institutions which calls into being the very need for such discussions. Presumably in the life of any institution which is moving in the direction suggested in the opening paragraphs of this article, there comes a time when the introduction of group discussion becomes profitable and possible so far as the social structure is concerned. Its development then depends upon the personalities of the staff.

From my personal knowledge of the penal field, I would say that on the whole the time is not yet ripe for this to happen in the majority of our prisons, save in one or two exceptional cases where the personalities involved have broken down many of the traditional rigidities of prison administration. The time is ripe, however, for the introduction into most of our Borstal institutions. In them the social structure is sufficiently fluid to accommodate this form of discussion. There would of course be exceptions where the personalities concerned are inappropriate. Regarding Approved Schools, Remand Homes and the like, I am less qualified to say; they represent so diverse a mixture that generalization is difficult. So far as can be seen, in most cases the social structure is appropriate; it is a question of personality and need controlling emergence.

There is one further field in which I feel group discussion to be most appropriate, namely that of staff training. Entry of the recruit to the penal field sets up all sorts of difficulties and tensions in the individual. In his early days he seeks eagerly for solutions to problems which, although they exist for senior members of the staff, have ceased to have the same urgency for them. The newcomer has not yet discovered the established formulæ by which anxieties are sealed off and minimized. He is, therefore, open to the discussion approach, the basic material for which is his own anxiety about his competence in dealing with the problems before him. In a fumbling way he often seeks guidance on this basis—usually in personal discussion. Often his guilt at his need to do so, or at even possessing such ‘weak’ feelings, is so considerable that they remain unexpressed and he makes no headway. In fields other than the penal, it is more clearly recognized that it is the personality of the member of the staff who is in contact with the patient, the client, the delinquent, or whatever the social casualty is called, which has a major impact upon him and also upon the atmosphere of the institution in which rehabilitation takes place. Group discussion which deals with the personality of the staff in a direct way is therefore a most potent instrument in the penal armoury. It is particularly applicable at the staff training stage, especially where there is some sort of central training organization at which new entrants can meet together under skilled guidance. In addition, of course, techniques learned there can percolate to the wider field.

It would seem an axiom that any institution which aims at educating its inmates towards some personal freedom must, if it is to be successful, offer the same opportunities for liberty to its staff. Indeed, its success in one aim will be the outcome of success in the other. Its organization and structure must be sufficiently flexible and ‘democratic’ to allow some free expression of the anxieties that inevitably arise in the face of socially disruptive behaviour. There can be no simple formula to achieve this, yet every harmonious and successful institution intuitively achieves it in part. The problem is a universal one, and if ‘permissive’ techniques are to find an increasingly potent place in the treatment of the socially aberrant, then solution to difficulties arising from staff strain and tension must also be sought.

SOCIOMETRIC ANALYSIS AND OBSERVATION

IN A BORSTAL INSTITUTION

BY GORDON ROSE (MANCHESTER)

North Sea Camp is situated on the shores of the Wash in Lincolnshire. Founded in 1935, its major purpose has always been to provide hard, but constructive, work in reclaiming marsh and putting it under cultivation. The work was originally carried out entirely by hand, but is now partly mechanized, though still very hard, especially in winter. There is no vocational training and the majority of the boys are occupied on the heavy labouring work of marsh and farm. The type of boy thus tends to be the tough, but not very bright sort of person, who would probably be a labourer, or in some kindred occupation, outside. Boys who have particularly bad work records are also sent, if they are healthy enough to stand the working conditions. The Camp is completely open and boys must, therefore, be reasonably likely not to abscond. They mainly fall in the mid-Borstal age range of 18-19 years. There are three houses, each consisting at the time of this study of about 35 boys. Each house has two dormitories, to which the boys are further allocated. The Camp is in permanent hutments. Each house has a Housemaster, one of whom acts as Deputy Governor, and there are the usual house, party and specialist officers and civilian instructors. There are three training grades. Grade I (Beginners' Grade) until five months from date of sentence; Grade II (Training Grade), into which promotion is almost automatic and which lasts, in this institution, till about nine months from date of sentence; and Grade III (Senior Training Grade), which lasts until the boy is discharged. Most privileges, which are mainly concerned with going out of Camp, accompany promotion to Grade II, but boys must move in escorted groups until they get to Grade III. Most boys are discharged in about 15-18 months from date of conviction. Pay is not related to grades, but is partly dependent upon the mark system. Each boy is given a mark, A, B, or C, for every half day, eleven per week. A mark of B or C entails deduction which varies according to the rate of earning. This depends upon the length of time served and effort made. The scale runs from 9d. to 4s. per week, most boys being on the 3s. rate.

In general, North Sea Camp is more restricted than most Borstals in type of work, and this tends to lead to some restriction in the range of boys sent to the institution. It also has some effect upon leisure pursuits, since the corollary to hard work on the marsh is more freedom to pursue one's own bent at week-ends. Nevertheless, a varied programme both of leisure pursuits and classes exists, as at all institutions. One might say, very roughly, that the Camp is somewhere about the middle of the range, so far as the outlook for successful retraining is concerned. It does not take the most hopeful lads, but it takes a better class than the closed institutions.

METHOD

The methodology of this project has already been explained in a previous article.¹ The research worker had originally thought in terms of a sociometric study, but this proved to be impossible. Nevertheless, at one point the Governor wanted to set up a number of small groups to go away for week-end camps or on hostelling week-ends together, and it was decided to ask boys whom they would and would not like to go with. Groups of five were to be set up, so each boy had four choices, and opportunity was also given for four rejections. The boys were collected in a room, duplicated sheets were distributed by a member of staff, the purpose explained briefly, and the boys wrote down their choices and rejections. Illiterates were taken aside and asked the questions in private by a housemaster. The standard of education is, of course, low, but no difficulty was experienced and there were no spoilt forms. The object throughout was to represent it as an ordinary event in the camp routine. So far as is known, the boys were not aware that any research was being done in the Camp, and the research worker, deliberately, did not visit the Camp at all on this occasion. There was much greater risk, it was felt, in the sudden appearance of the research worker in his true rôle (various versions of his regular visits were current, none of them true), than in having the whole thing done by the staff.

RESULTS

The first task is the analysis of the sociometric questionnaire. Choices and rejections are considered together. I have not attempted to define an indifference zone, as is often done, as this appears to me to be very arbitrary. I consider only the general balance of choices and rejections for each boy.

¹ *British Journal of Delinquency*, Vol. VI., No. 3, Jan. 1956.

CHOICES LESS REJECTIONS

CHOSEN								REJECTED			
House	Dormi- tory	No. of boys receiving		No. of boys receiving		Nil Sum	Total No. of Boys				
		7 and over	Under 7	7 and over	Under 7						
A . .	1	2	5	2	6	1	16				
	2	1	9	1	3	1	15				
B . .	3	2	7	3	5	—	17				
	4	3	12	—	3	—	18				
C . .	5	—	12	2	4	1	19				
	6	3	8	2	3	—	16				
		11	53	10	24	3	101				

Thus 64 boys were on balance chosen, and 34 rejected, while 3 had equal numbers of choices and rejections (which amounted to 1, 2 and 4 respectively). It will be seen that Houses B and C have much the same proportion of chosen to rejected, about 2 to 1, and House C, a smaller house, about $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 1. The most interesting groups are, of course, those most chosen and most rejected. To take the latter first, there are several lads who stand out as obvious rejects, a situation typical of this type of analysis. The most clearly marked of these is ELI² who registers no choices and 25 rejections distributed over all three houses. It is significant that his questionnaire was returned marked in the choice section 'Don't Know'. Rivalling him with 22 rejections and 1 choice is EKC, and with 24 rejections and 2 choices is NES. NES is the first choice of EKC and vice versa, and NES's other choice comes from KAL who himself has 19 rejections and 2 choices (not from the other two). We shall return to the question of the positions that these boys hold in the camp community later on, but it should be pointed out here that ELI is undoubtedly an individual reject, and is a poor, solitary, unhappy lad; while the other three form a strong anti-authority group, with which others are associated.

The lads most chosen record fewer choices, again typical of sociometric analyses; LEW has 11 choices and no rejections, and AME has the same; NIM has 10 choices and no rejections and IKG has 9; GGI has 12

² The letter code does *not* consist of the boy's initials, and he cannot be identified without knowledge of the code.

choices and 4 rejections. According to the staff, these lads have strong group associations, but of varying positions in the group. The three with Nil sums also appear to vary considerably in group relationships. TIE is constantly seen with a group of lads, AHS with only one lad, and NAR is almost completely isolated.

The following table shows the number of reciprocated choices:

RECIPROCATED CHOICES

<i>House</i>	<i>Dormitory</i>	<i>Both first choice reciprocated in own dormitory</i>	<i>Other choices both in own dormitory</i>	<i>Reciprocated in other dormitory of same house</i>	<i>Reciprocated in other houses</i>
A .	1	4	10	1	2
	2	4	15	1	5
B .	3	3	7	3	3
	4	3	14	3	3
C .	5	Nil	13	2	2
	6	3	12	2	6

In addition to these there are a number of boys who are rejected by those they choose. These are interesting since the choosers in all but two cases have minus Choice Rejection Scores, therefore are more rejected than chosen (and in these cases the scores are Nil and + 1), whereas with the exception of a Nil and one heavily rejected boy, the rejectors all have plus scores.

The table points to a difference amongst the houses. House A seems to be strongly integrated within each dormitory and the other houses less so. Each, however, has similar numbers of reciprocations in other houses.

COMPARISON WITH STAFF OPINIONS

Most of the information utilized in this section was provided by the housemaster who stated which boys he had observed associating at the time that the questionnaire was given. This information was charted under four heads: Other Free Time, Bounds, Cinema, Games, according to the area in which the associations were noted. 'Bounds' refers to parties of boys going out together round the boundaries of the camp, a limitation imposed on Grade II. Most of the recording is in 'Other Free Time' which refers to the evening and week-end free recreational periods, times when the housemaster has most opportunity to see boys. He ought to know about bounds parties, and he generally has records of organized games, but he is often

dependent upon observation of the house officers for cinema groupings and non-organized games. There is also some variation in the degree of choice possible so far as the boy is concerned. This is widest in 'Other Free Time' although it may be partly restricted by ability to play indoor games, and by different hours worked by a few boys, on special jobs such as stoking or kitchen. 'Other Free Time' is therefore regarded as the best indicator, since it combines maximum housemaster observation with maximum area of choice. 'Bounds' is dependent upon grades; organized games upon skill and selection; cinema in the camp is uncontrolled and therefore a good indicator, but cinema parties to Boston depend upon grade and possession of the (reduced) price of entry.

There are also recorded the table at which the boy sits in the dining room, where he works, whom he sleeps next to, and his grade. These will be discussed later.

House C shows the clearest groupings. There is very little recorded in any column but 'Other Free Time', so the following remarks are based on a chart drawn from this information exclusively. There are four clearly marked groups of associates in the chart drawn from information upon the housemaster's record sheet. The results of the questionnaire show very much the same patterns, with some slight variations. There are seven pairs shown on the chart but not recorded as reciprocated choices on the questionnaire. Four of them are unreciprocated choices, however; one is actually an unreciprocated rejection. On the other hand, of 11 reciprocations on the questionnaire, only one appears on the chart. The groupings in this house emerge very clearly from both the questionnaire and the chart, but pairings are not at all well reproduced.

In House B the situation is much more complicated. There is a strong anti-authority group in this house which is widely rejected. This consists of the three boys EXC, NES, KAL, mentioned above as scoring very low on Choice-Rejection. The group shows up on the housemaster's record as consisting also of KNA and GGI, and as having some connections with AME in particular and several other boys in a minor way. The group comes out of the questionnaire fairly clearly although NES chooses only EKC and none of the others; KNA chooses only AME, and GGS only KAL and AME. Both EXC and NES choose boys by whom they are rejected. It is possible that this group is affected in naming their choices by official discouragement of their activities. In particular, KNA and GGI may feel that they ought not to show themselves as associated with the three boys forming the kernel of the group.

The questionnaire when analysed into reciprocations shows four other groups. Of 13 reciprocations on the questionnaire, only three appear

fairly clearly on the charts. Agreement is on the whole poor in this house.

In House A there is a pretty clear central grouping of seven boys, six of whom are associated in the questionnaire results. The questionnaire does, however, break this group down into clearer sub-groups. Two other groups also correspond reasonably well and, while not as clear as House C, the groupings are pretty well reproduced in this house. A cross house grouping with House C also comes out well. Of 14 pairs of reciprocated choices only one could be clearly picked out on the charts, and of 20 pairs on the charts only two are non-reciprocated choices and two are rejections. In this house the major groups are clear enough, but there is very little correspondence in pairs.

This, in fact, seems to be the general position. Housemasters pick out major groupings without much difficulty, but pairing, unless it results in a very obvious friendship, rarely corresponds with choices. One has to remember, however, that, apart from first choices, there must be some doubt about how far acquaintances are linked together in what appear to be friendship pairs by the forced choice situation of the questionnaire. What level of relationship is one to expect under the heading of 'friendship' amongst adolescents of this age group in a Borstal situation? It is likely that strong attachments rarely arise and that most of these pairs are of the 'rub-along' variety. On the other hand, the questionnaire is probably penetrating to a level of preference not possible for housemasters. It is unfortunate that it was not possible to repeat the questionnaire, or something like it, in order to test stability of pairing.

TABLE GROUPS

The table at which the boy sits is of some importance due to the fact that he tends to sit with his own friends, and that the table groups often maintain a kind of mutual financial arrangement whereby there is a certain amount of pooling of resources for the purpose of obtaining canteen goods. It is not known how far this arrangement was maintained, but a study of table arrangements shows a distinct tendency for those with similar earnings to sit together. (It should be remembered that earnings are not related to grades, but follow a time scale of their own.) Each table seats four, and, except on reception, boys generally have ample opportunity to choose their own table.

Obviously these groupings tend to be in a state of flux and an examination of them for one month only is unlikely to give very good results. The mere length of time a boy has been on a table is also not a very good indicator as some boys are adopted into groups very quickly and others always remain

rejects but must sit somewhere. An analysis of moves is probably the best approach, but this is too complex to have a direct bearing upon the questionnaire results which refer to one month only. All that can be said in this context is that the table groupings follow the 'other free time' groupings to a considerable extent (there is probably some haloing), and in one respect it agrees more closely with the questionnaire. In cases where there are only two on a table, they generally show up as reciprocations in the questionnaire. There are six pairs of this kind, two in each house, and of these four are reciprocations, one an unreciprocated choice (but in fact other evidence strongly points to a friendship between this pair), and in one there is no connection. This, therefore, may be some help on the question of pairing upon which there is much disagreement between choice and observation.

WORK, SLEEPING ARRANGEMENTS

Neither of these is much help in the present context. Reclamation of the marsh engrosses the largest work party and there are so many on this that small groupings would not emerge. Indications by housemasters that boys consort with the rest of their work group (one boy, for instance, is marked 'other (matron's) store lads') are not borne out by the questionnaire. Work would be expected to act as a cross-house factor in groupings, but, while this may be so, the size of the marsh party hides these. There is, surprisingly, little indication that the kitchen lads stay together outside work. One would expect a clique to grow here due to the possibilities of 'fiddling', but against this must be set the awareness of the danger on the part of the staff, who control it carefully. It was unfortunate that we could not use a questionnaire referring specifically to work groupings, as these may be somewhat different from those recorded.

There is a fair amount of choice as regards sleeping arrangements. Housemasters normally allow a boy to move into a vacant bed or change with another boy. We should thus expect friends to move next to each other. There is some evidence of this. Thus a pair of friends of long standing in House A are in adjoining beds, and a group of three are together. In House C, the housemaster was utilizing a small room at the end of the hut as a dormitory and a clearly marked group of 'mates' had congregated in it.

LEADERS AND SOCIOCENTRES

As previously stated, each boy was given a position in relation to grouping. This was done at a staff meeting and reflects the joint judgment of the senior staff, although his housemaster's opinion naturally counts for a great

deal. These recordings show a considerable preponderance of placings as follower (choice) (as distinct from follower (weak) which was included to show the very weak hanger-on) and this category has come to be a kind of general nothing-particular-noticed class. Forty-eight of the 101 boys have this classification. If, however, these are omitted, it is still found that the extreme choice rejection scores are not reflected in any consistent way in the classifications made. The same is true of most and least chosen.

There are three possible explanations for this. The staff may vary considerably in its judgments, and may not be maintaining a consistent view of the meanings of the various categories. There may also be some true variation in the actual meaning of the categories as applied in differing group situations. And, following from this, the sociocentre as indicated by the questionnaire results may not represent the same kind of continuum as the categories.

A full investigation of this point would have involved questioning the boys upon their choices, which was not permissible. The results obtained by Jennings from this procedure are interesting, but do not appear to me to support her assumption that most chosen = leader.³ The source of the difficulty seems to me to lie in the assumption that the word 'leader' has only one meaning or a limited range of meanings. In fact, it is extremely difficult to separate the concept from that of patterning. The leader tends to be the person who predominates in a particular group situation, and there is a large variety of group situations. Assuming that by 'leader' we mean someone who is able by persuasion or domination to initiate action or affect the actions of others to a considerable degree, there appear to be three main variables involved in the process of identification, at least in a Borstal setting.

(1) *Group Cohesion*. The leader's position will depend to some extent upon how closely knit the group is. It is possible to have considerable influence over one's contemporaries without their being organized in a strongly marked group—i.e. the following is variable, but there generally is one.

(2) *Degree of Influence*. This tends to vary with group cohesion. In the close knit group the leader is more likely to be able to give orders which are carried out. He is therefore more likely to be a leader by force, as against the persuasive kind. On the other hand, the *leader at large*, i.e. the person whom people tend to follow, but who does not form any clear groupings, is more likely to be a leader from prowess and through persuasion. There are, however, various degrees of dominance within these two general categories.

³ In 'Leadership and Isolation' (2nd Edition). Longmans, 1950.

(3) *Size of Group.* Some of those who appear to be in dominant positions have very few followers. It is often difficult to know whether to class them as leaders or would-be leaders, but if they have a constant following they are put down as leaders.

An examination of the available data leads to the conviction that degree of influence and group coherence cannot be separated. We are thus led to postulate the following types of leaders: (1) Group Leader—high influence in group of high cohesion.⁴ (2) Small Group Leader—high influence, but very few constant followers, sometimes only one or two. (3) Leader at Large—high influence in general, no clear following.

It is of interest that Clemmer, whose book the writer was unable to trace until the above was already written, finds it necessary to make similar distinctions. 'There is a difference,' he says, 'between the leader whose rank is based on primary relations and the leader produced by secondary relations,' and he assigns the word 'leader' to 'the man who becomes the centre of rapport in the primary and semi-primary groups', and the term 'popular' to 'the person who, through secondary relationships, has recognized status in large groups', while later he excludes small groups 'not that leaders may not exist in them, but due to the lack of broad influence of these dyads and triads', a phrase which I do not understand. 'It has been learned,' he continues, 'that in these small groups one member is usually dominant and the other submissive, in varying degrees.'⁵ His formulations are rather more vague than they need be, however, and I do not think that the word 'popular' is sufficiently descriptive of the nature of leadership in a large group.

Returning to the three possible explanations set out above, there would appear to be variations in the meaning of the categories according to situation. How far staff judgments varied is impossible to say. There is no way of setting up a criterion by which to assess such a variation.

The most interesting point in the present context is what the effect of the above ought to be upon a comparison with questionnaire results. There is an added difficulty in that, as suggested, we cannot assume that 'most chosen' means leadership. Of the four most chosen in House C only one is considered to be a leader, while two others who are classed as leaders are in fact least chosen. In House B there is a highly rejected group, already referred to, which, not surprisingly, has a leader. In House A all the most chosen appear, from what is known of their personalities, to be unlikely candidates for leadership.

The consequence of our analysis of leadership leads us to concentrate

⁴ The degree of cohesion is assessed from constancy of association.

⁵ Clemmer, D. 'The Prison Community.' Christopher, Boston, 1940, pp. 134-6.

much more upon the patterning of choices in relation to choice status, than upon the latter alone. Looked at in this light, it would appear that choice scores could hardly tell us anything about the leadership of sub-groups. The only way such groups can be identified, so far as the writer can see, is on the basis of reciprocations. If a member of such a group is chosen by many people he thus becomes a popular person who himself can only return two, three, or four of the choices (he only has four, perhaps an unfortunate limitation; but none of the groupings appears to be large). There is no reason why his status in the group and his status in the house at large should coincide. If it be argued that leaders need not return choices, then we are left with the proposition that high choice scores identify leaders-at-large only. In fact, however, this seems doubtful since there are numerous reasons why a boy might be popular. He might, for instance, to put it on the lowest level, be the constant recipient of parcels from home, or a homosexual. I do not think that there is much to be gained from attempting to identify leaders from the sociometric questionnaire, but Jennings' method of questioning both girls and staff about the most chosen might well be utilized in other spheres, and perhaps approached from a standpoint which does not assume what is to be proved.

The questionnaire also shows a number of highly rejected boys. Of these the most clearly rejected is ELI in House C who has 25 rejections and no choices. ELI is shown by the housemaster as a weak follower, although this seems to be wishful thinking in this particular assessment since in other monthly assessments he is shown as an isolate. Of two other boys highly rejected in House C, FOR is shown as a follower, which seems erroneous, and OTT, who has 12 rejections, but also 5 choices, is shown as the leader of a small group. This is only doubtfully reproduced on the chart of reciprocations where he is shown as reciprocating with only one person in the group. In House B there is a highly rejected group which has already been referred to, and upon which there is good agreement, but it has its own leader, recorded by the staff. Of two boys rejected in House A, EDK has 13 rejections and 3 choices and is marked as lieutenant to IDO, the leader of a small group. This would be quite possible since lieutenants, who do the dirty work, are often much disliked. OSB has 10 rejections and no choices but is marked as a follower, which again seems to be a mistake. Another boy with 11 rejections and 3 choices is also marked as a lieutenant, but at other times has been marked as the leader of a small anti-authority group. He is an interesting case of a boy with gang leader fantasies who generally fails to become effective as a leader and is disliked by most and sometimes followed by a few. Agreement on rejections is clearly not good.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The findings may be summarized as follows: (1) The observed groupings are much more clearly marked in House C, and correspond much more nearly with groupings derived from a study of reciprocations. This may be due to a true difference in the intensity of association between houses, or to better observation, or a mixture of the two. If the latter, we might conclude that the questionnaire tended to reveal the true situation better than observation.

(2) There is a fair degree of correspondence between groupings, but very little between pairs. This may reflect a forced choice situation, but may also again demonstrate difficulties in maintaining accurate observation. It is not, of course, essential for the housemaster to note *all* pairs in the house, and, indeed, unless they are of a continuing nature, they are unlikely to be of any importance. I am inclined to think that the questionnaire is more accurate here, but the results must be interpreted with caution, and only first choice reciprocations are likely to be of real importance.

(3) The above refers mainly to groupings observed under the heading of 'other free time'. The results are less marked under 'bounds', 'games', 'cinema', but these should be considered together with 'other free time'. There is little correspondence with work groups or whom a boy sleeps next to.

(4) Table groupings are often similar to the 'other free time' assessments, which may be affected by them, but such groups cannot be deduced from study of tables alone. Where there are only two on a table, this often corresponds with reciprocations, and this may be a limited guide to pairings.

(5) The extreme choice rejection scores are not represented in any consistent way in staff assessments of position in relation to grouping, and neither choice nor choice-rejection seems to be a reliable guide to leadership, largely, it is suggested, because leaders cannot be thought of without reference to the type of group they lead. A distinction is suggested between the group leader, the small group leader and the leader at large.

The main point here is that staff assessments were not concerned with popularity, but with position in group. Whole groups may be generally rejected or particular boys in them may be greatly disliked. This is especially likely to be true of those boys who are most active in attempting to intimidate others and who may be merely the 'strong arm men' to the leader of an anti-authority group.

A further point of interest is that in House B, the rejected group is also rejected by, and rejects, two other generally rejected boys. This House appears in fact to consist of a fairly well-organized core, consisting of several groups of boys and a number of others more or less associated with them,

an equally strongly organized rejected group, two fairly clear rejects who are not associated with the rejected group, and two other less strongly rejected boys, who also reject, and are rejected by, the rejected group. The source of this high degree of organization is probably the rejected group whose activities threaten the position of others in the house.

On the whole our expectation that the questionnaire would be a more sensitive instrument is confirmed, but it seems clear that housemasters' statements about groupings are reasonably accurate although this probably varies to some extent from house to house, and from time to time. On the other hand, one would suspect that any results derived from a questionnaire are too clear-cut to represent the actual situation adequately, and any idea of grouping is likely to be hazy round the edges, precisely because groups are, in fact, hazy round the edges. Any estimate of grouping expresses only a general belief that the persons concerned do act together, or would act together in certain situations, and it is likely that in varying circumstances the group would change its constitution to some extent. The fact that we are here considering only one point in time and limited criteria probably in itself misrepresents the true situation.

RESEARCH AND METHODOLOGY

(Continued from Vol. VI, p. 217)

CURRENT RESEARCH. XLVIII. CRIME AND DELINQUENCY IN LEICESTER AND LEICESTERSHIRE.

(1) *Name of University Department, Hospital, or other Institution or private person supplying the information:* Dr. Howard Jones, Tutor in Social Studies, University College, Leicester.

(2) *Subject of Research:* A study of adult crime and juvenile delinquency in Leicester and Leicestershire: their local distribution, and special characteristics, and their relationship to other social problems of the area, such as poverty, slums, tuberculosis, infantile mortality, and truancy.

(3) *Research Worker:* Dr. Howard Jones.

(4) *Commenced:* 1955.

(5) *Publication:* No results so far published.

RESEARCH NOTE

A NOTE ON STATISTICAL METHODS OF PREDICTING DELINQUENCY

(1) There is no doubt that our understanding of the causes of juvenile delinquency has been immeasurably increased by the work of Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck. Probably one of their major contributions has been the development of prediction tables which, they thought, could be applied at school entrance. In their own words: 'The selection of potential delinquents at the time of school entrance or soon thereafter would make possible the application of treatment measures that would be truly crime preventive. . . . It therefore becomes of crucial importance to develop prognostic instrumentalities that can be applied to children at the point of school entrance, without waiting for the actual appearance of serious and persistent anti-sociality'.¹

They developed prediction tables which could be applied to groups of school children to sort out those children who have a large chance of being delinquent from those who have a very small chance of being delinquent. The purpose of this note is to show that the prediction methods used are much less efficient than the Gluecks claim, and that the chances of a boy with a high 'weighted failure score' (over 300) becoming delinquent are not 89.2 (per hundred) but only about 14.1 (per hundred).

(2) The methods of the Glueck study are too well known to require more than a brief survey here. They selected 500 delinquents and matched, against each delinquent, a non-delinquent of a similar age, intelligence quotient, ethnico-racial origin and with a similar area of residence; so that the sample consisted of 1,000—500 delinquent and 500 non-delinquent. For prediction purposes, the Gluecks selected five factors describing the social background of the boys. One of the factors, for example, was the discipline of boy by father which was divided into the following three sub-categories:—

Overstrict or erratic	.	.	.	.	72.5
Lax	.	.	.	.	59.8
Firm but kindly	.	.	.	.	9.3

The figures at the side of the sub-categories are called the *weighted failure scores*; they indicate the percentage of children falling in that particular category who are, in fact, delinquent, so that, for example, 72.5 per cent. of those children who have overstrict or erratic discipline by the father are delinquent.

¹ S. and E. Glueck, 'Unravelling Juvenile Delinquency', Harvard, October 1950.

The weighted failure scores for each boy were added to produce a total weighted failure score and each delinquent and non-delinquent boy was assigned to a score class to produce the following table:—

TABLE I

Detailed prediction table from five factors of social background

<i>Weighted failure score class</i>	<i>Number of delinquents</i>	<i>Chances of delinquency (per hundred)</i>	<i>Number of non-delinquents</i>	<i>Chances of non-delinquency (per hundred)</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Under 150	5	2.9	167	97.1
150-199 .	19	15.7	102	84.3
200-249 .	40	37.0	68	63.0
250-299 .	122	63.5	70	36.5
300-349 .	141	86.0	23	14.0
350-399 .	73	90.1	8	9.9
400 and over	51	98.1	1	1.9
TOTAL .	451		439	

Column 3 of Table I—what the Gluecks call the ‘Chances of Delinquency (per hundred)’—is calculated by finding the percentage of all boys in a given failure score class who are delinquent. Similarly, column 5—the ‘Chances of Non-Delinquency (per hundred)’—shows the percentage of the total boys in a score class who are not delinquent. The Gluecks suggest that, in practice, one may prefer to use a classification of four, three or two score classes. The table of three classes is reproduced below:

TABLE II

Three-class prediction table from five factors of social background

<i>Weighted failure score class</i>	<i>Chances of delinquency (per hundred)</i>	<i>Chances of non-delinquency (per hundred)</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)
Under 250 .	16.0	84.0
250-299 .	63.5	36.5
300 and over .	89.2	10.8

The Gluecks remark: ‘It would seem to us that for practical purposes it again makes little difference whether the chances of potential delinquency are six and a half in ten or about nine in ten, because a boy falling into either score class would have to be looked upon as a potential offender for the purpose of preventive therapy’.

(3) From the foregoing, it is clear that the Gluecks interpret the 'chance of delinquency' as the probability of any child chosen at random from a population with conditions similar to those of his sample being delinquent. But this would be the *true* probability of delinquency only *if the proportion of delinquents in the population as a whole was the same as that proportion in the sample*. Since the proportion of delinquents in the population as a whole is probably something like 2 or 4 per cent., it is clear that the 'Chances of Delinquency' in Tables I and II above assumes a delinquency percentage as high as $\left(\frac{451}{451 - 439} \times 100 \text{ per cent.}\right)$ 51 per cent. it follows that the probability of delinquency is much less than that shown in the above tables.

(4) To demonstrate this proposition the simplest approach is to imagine the sort of results which you would get if a *random* sample of boys were taken. If we can assume that the proportion of delinquency in this population were 2 per cent., then to get 451 delinquents (Table I) in the sample, one would have to make the total size of the sample about $\left(\frac{100}{2} \times 451\right)$ 22,550, which would on the average contain 22,099 non-delinquents and 451 delinquents.² We already know the distribution of the delinquents according to total weighted failure score—the figures are given in column 2 of Table I. We do not know how our 22,099 non-delinquents would be distributed according to weighted failure score, but clearly our best assumption is that they would be distributed in the same way as the Glueck sample of 439 non-delinquents (column 4 of Table I) so that, for example, the number of non-delinquents with a score under 150 would be $\frac{167}{439} \times 22,099$, *i.e.* 8,406. The distribution of the 22,099 non-delinquents is shown in column 4 of the following table:—

TABLE III
Corrected prediction table from five factors of social background

<i>Weighted failure score class</i>	<i>Number of delinquents</i>	<i>Best estimates of true chances of delinquency (per hundred)</i>	<i>Number of non-delinquents</i>	<i>Best estimates of true chances of non-delinquency (per hundred)</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Under 150 .	5	0.06	8,406	99.94
150-199 .	19	0.37	5,135	99.63
200-249 .	40	1.16	3,423	98.84
250-299 .	122	3.35	3,524	96.65
300-349 .	141	10.85	1,158	89.15
350-399 .	73	15.34	403	84.66
400 and over	51	50.50	50	49.50
TOTAL .	451		22,099	

² These proportions are, of course, subject to sampling errors, which, for expository purposes, I ignore.

In column 3 of the above table, we show the percentage of those boys in the sample who fall in a weighted failure score class and were delinquent; and in column 5, the percentage who were not delinquent is listed. Clearly we may regard these sample percentages as the best estimates of the corresponding percentages in the population which are the *true* probabilities of delinquency (per hundred). Corresponding to Table II, above, we then have Table IV which sets out the *true* chances of delinquency in three score classes.

TABLE IV

Adjusted three-class prediction table from five factors of social background

<i>Weighted failure score class</i>	<i>True chances of delinquency (per hundred)</i>	<i>True chances of non-delinquency (per hundred)</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)
Under 250 .	0.38	99.62
250-299 . .	3.35	96.65
300 and over .	14.13	85.87

(5) In using these tables, we would identify those boys with a weighted failure score class of 300 and over as 'potential offenders'. But if our calculations and assumptions are correct, only 14.1 per cent. will, on the average, actually become offenders and the remaining 85.9 per cent. will be incorrectly identified; these figures should be compared with the 89.2 per cent. correct and 10.8 per cent. incorrect forecasts claimed by the Gluecks. The implications of these results for the distribution of resources between various kinds of preventive therapy are interesting, but we cannot examine them here.³

(6) This criticism cannot be made against *all* prediction methods used in conjunction with criminal statistics. In many studies, the authors have been concerned with predicting the success or failure of corrective training or a term of imprisonment. In these cases the investigators usually took a more or less unbiased sample of the population (*e.g.* the number of criminals of a given type discharged in a particular year) and based the prediction table on these data. And there was no reason to suppose that the success ratio and the distribution of the factors of prediction in the population were very different from those in the sample.

(7) In the most recent study of delinquency,⁴ the authors develop their prediction tables using a sub-sample of 385 cases, for which enough information on prediction factors was available, from the original sample of 720 cases. In the sub-sample, the success rate was 57.5 per cent. compared with 45 per cent. for the total

³ The same criticism may be made about the prediction tables calculated from the Rorschach Test and from the Psychiatric Interview.

⁴ Mannheim and Wilkins, 'Prediction Methods in Relation to Borstal Training', London, H.M.S.O., 1955.

sample. Since the authors recognize the existence of this bias,⁵ it is strange that they did not attempt to adjust the prediction tables in the same way that we have adjusted the Glueck table above; but in any case the adjustment would affect only slightly the predictive efficiency of their tables.

(8) In conclusion one is tempted to mention the list of other criticisms which could be made against prediction tables, but fortunately an extensive and constructive criticism is now available in Mannheim and Wilkins. Their study seems to be first to apply the methods of multi-variate analysis to the problem of prediction. I should have preferred to find a discriminant function⁶ rather than calculate weights from a least squares multiple regression equation; but that is another story.

A. A. WALTERS,
Lecturer in Statistics,
University of Birmingham.

COMMENTARY

Mr. Walters' note stresses a very important point. In selecting weighted samples the Gluecks were not essentially in error; they were, however, misleading in that they did not point out to their readers how this weighting would affect their results when applied to a 'real life' case. There are many pitfalls in the matching technique, of which the one pointed out by Mr. Walters is perhaps the most obvious. But it is one which *need not* lead to error of itself. Randomization is generally better than matching for the obvious reason that in the process of matching some factors may be included without their effects being realized or observed.

Whilst I agree with Mr. Walters in his criticism of others I do not (perhaps naturally!) agree when he criticizes my work with Dr. H. Mannheim. I think he has misunderstood his reading of our book. This is excusable since it was written for the general reader and the statistical work was not fully detailed. He thinks that we should have corrected for the bias in the sample upon which the tables were constructed in the same way as he has shown for the Gluecks' work. This would be agreed if the bias were due to a weighted sampling procedure. In our case the bias was of a different kind. It was due to the data themselves. A correction would have had to assume that the pattern of information which was not available could have been estimated from data which were available. We knew, however, that the availability of the data was correlated differently for different items with the criteria. I think Mr. Walters will agree that in view of this we were correct in considering that any attempted correction might have led only to superficial improvement. We preferred for this reason to indicate the problem since we did not feel that any correction (which means standardization by a statistic or statistics based on the whole and part sample) would have been safe. The wisdom of this seems to have been demonstrated by the results of the validation study.

Mr. Walters also says that he would have preferred to have seen a discriminant solution. Discriminant analysis was in fact used. As Mr. Walters will realize, the mathematical basis for both multiple regression and discriminant analysis is the same—namely 'least squares'. The discriminant only was not regarded as the best solution, since we decided that something ought to be done about the 'centre/unpredictable' group. Such a case does not arise in the classical form of the discriminant—people are either male or female, belong to a particular race or not and so on. It seemed necessary, therefore, to use the estimates of probability (based on least squares) which form the basis for the discriminant function, rather than merely to quote the

⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 156 and 162–163.

⁶ See, for example, M. G. Kendall, 'The Advanced Theory of Statistics', Vol. II, pp. 341 *et seq.*

'characteristic equations' which would have been the end product of the direct discriminant approach. By this means we were able to apply the discriminant function *twice!* This is not obvious from our discussion since the results were presented in a form which it was thought would be most generally understood.

Since the question of optimum techniques has been raised by implication, I wonder if Mr. Walters would agree that the discriminant is not most suited to the problem? If he had recommended the concepts of the theory of strategy, I would have agreed that this affords the most powerful tool, but would have pleaded that at the moment we are not sufficiently agreed about the moral philosophy of treatment of offenders to formulate statistical models in these terms. Perhaps I may quote from our book on this point. 'We should not merely minimize the *number* of wrong decisions, but minimize the *harm* that would be done by making wrong decisions. . . . The problem now is not *how* to predict, the methods exist—but *what* to predict, and who shall formulate the problems.' (IX. 12.)

LESLIE T. WILKINS.

NOTES AND CRITICISMS

THE LAW AND THE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED OFFENDER

A report on the evidence given to the Royal Commission on the Law relating to Mental Illness and Mental Deficiency

'I wish I really knew what people are referring to when they speak of psychopaths.'—THE RT. HON. THE LORD PERCY OF NEWCASTLE, *Chairman*.

The Royal Commission started hearing evidence in May 1954 and ceased in July 1955, so that the published minutes, amounting to 1,270 pages, can now be reviewed as a whole. The definition and diagnosis of mental defect, early stated as 'one of the most important subjects with which the Commission will have to deal', inevitably called for a consideration of the psychopathic offender, and made it certain that the evidence given would be of considerable interest to criminologists. It is hoped that this analysis and commentary on the evidence which was concerned with offenders will illustrate the variety of opinions held and help to clarify the present position.

It might be mentioned in passing that the minutes of the first day¹ offer a neatly tabulated summary of the relevant law of England and Wales (including a table showing the various methods of dealing with mentally ill or mentally defective persons charged with or found guilty of criminal offences) which is an advance on the corresponding sections of existing text-books.

¹ 'Royal Commission on the Law relating to Mental Illness and Mental Deficiency'. *Minutes of Evidence*, first day. London: H.M.S.O., 1954. Price 3s.

Certification of Offenders as Mentally Deficient. Section 8 of the Mental Deficiency Act, 1913, which enables a court to send certain offenders and children to mental deficiency institutions, or to order a petition to be made to that end, on the evidence of only one medical practitioner, came in for much discussion and criticism. It seems probable, from the consistency of opinion on the matter, that two medical certificates will in the future be required, one of them from a specially qualified practitioner. The doubt as to whether a young person (14-17 years) is also 'covered' by the Section will also be cleared up. Whether the court itself should make the order for detention or whether the local authority should be left to make appropriate arrangements is more uncertain. The obvious argument that the local authority is likely to have more experience and knowledge of possible disposals is to some extent cancelled by the shortage of accommodation, which, according to more than one witness, is the reason why the local authority itself is sometimes 'behind' these applications, in the hope of jumping the queue for a particularly pressing case. Further, the Commission knows of cases where the court has not had the advantage of full medical and social reports, and it is possible that in courts of assize or quarter session there may be insufficient time to defer a case for a specialist's report. In this connection the Justices for the County of Devon suggest that these higher courts are handicapped as compared with magistrates' courts in that the cost of an independent medical examination cannot be met by any order.

Opinion is divided as to whether the period of detention in the institution under this section should be governed by clinical considerations or by the maximum period of the appropriate prison sentence. Maximum sentences, however, 'bear no relation to what people these days think reasonable'. For burglary and buggery there is the possibility of life imprisonment; 'even for petty larceny one may go to gaol for five years.' The frequency of opinion that persons, especially youngsters, may be held on what looks like an indeterminate sentence for trivial offences, which might have been dealt with much more simply, suggests, however, that some further safeguard, perhaps review at stated intervals, will be welcome. This may be of increasing importance if any of the pleas for extension of the powers of the court to deal with the psychopath are conceded.

Apparently some defectives, especially if already known to be such at the time of committing an offence, are returned by magistrates and judges to an institution without proceeding to a conviction, the court register simply being 'marked' in some way. The lawyers seemed to feel that a conditional or absolute discharge would be preferable, for that would be more regular and would allow a better control of the case in the event of a further offence.

The Chairman called attention to complaints that a young man may commit an offence, for which the ordinary penalty would be a small fine, and may then find himself remanded for a mental report without his mental condition ever having been raised as a matter of evidence in court proceedings. In the case of juveniles such an abuse is already covered by a high court judgment (*Rex v. Toynbee Hall Justices*) so that further legislation is unlikely to be called for. Possibly the real source of these complaints is the period of waiting in mental deficiency institutions, or places of safety, as allowed under Sect. 8 (3) and (4). Excessive use of these provisions might again be due to the shortage of accommodation. Indeed, in nearly all the topics discussed by the Commission, shortage of

accommodation or of staff seemed to be directly or indirectly involved, a fact which did not seem to receive enough emphasis.

Certification in Prison. Another point concerning shortage of accommodation for mental defectives, raised by the Magistrates' Association, is the 'temptation . . . to send a defendant, suspected of being mentally defective, to prison (without remand for enquiry into his mental condition), for it seems certain that if this course is taken the prison medical authorities will ascertain the mental defectiveness of the person and his transfer to a suitable institution will take place more quickly from prison'. This the Association rightly holds to be very unfair, for it involves the stigma of a prison sentence, which might have been avoided by remand in custody or on bail for suitable reports.

The Magistrates' Association further consider that the procedure for certification as insane in prisons and Borstals should conform with the procedure outside, and that only a justice who is a judicial authority should carry it out. They also want provision to be made for an independent medical opinion before adjudicating on a prisoner suspected of mental illness.

Broadmoor Patients. Although the terms of reference of the Commission specifically exclude the Broadmoor patient, certain matters concerning their transfer to other establishments were put forward, in particular by the Royal Medico-Psychological Association. This Association favours a continuation of the practice of admitting comparatively minor offenders, in whose cases, had their mental disorder been present at the time of their offences, there would have been no question of the propriety of their admission to mental hospitals. It is suggested, however, that the stigma of the term 'Broadmoor patient' should be avoided (the B.M.A. propose 'Home Office patient'). The medical superintendent of the receiving hospital should be given an opportunity of stating his opinion as to the suitability of the admission. For those who, having been certified in prison and admitted to Broadmoor, have finished their sentence and would normally be transferred to a mental hospital, it is recommended that such transfers should be subject to the opinion of the medical superintendent of Broadmoor as to their suitability. The B.M.A. add that the receiving medical superintendent should also have a say in the matter. If considered unsuitable, these patients should remain at Broadmoor. Conversely, the very occasional mental hospital patient whose homicidal tendencies make him very disturbing should be transferred to Broadmoor much as the comparable mental defective can be sent to Rampton. It is also recommended that the anomaly by which Broadmoor patients in mental hospitals are unable to earn 'remission' by good conduct should be corrected.

The Juvenile Courts. With the notable exception of the evidence from approved schools, few specific criticisms or suggestions were made regarding the juvenile court system, though their prophylactic function was frequently invoked. It was suggested, for example, that the net for adult psychopathic offenders should really be cast in the juvenile courts. One has every sympathy with the witness who was asked: 'What extended powers in the Juvenile Court would you suggest for the child whom you recognize say at 10 or 12 as a psychopath?' Perhaps if the question had been: 'What extended provisions outside the Juvenile Courts . . .' it might have been a little easier to answer, but not very much, for so little is known as to what is really needed, and the little that is known is not to be applied like a dose of medicine or a convalescent holiday. It was striking that

the suggestions made regarding the handling of adult offenders were closely comparable to the corresponding existing facilities for delinquents; they were in fact often in effect adult 'editions' of approved-hostels, -homes, and -schools, schools (communities) for maladjusted children, Borstal establishments. Sometimes proposed innovations seemed to be precisely what already exists, so that the Chairman's remark in another context—'. . . the great danger is that the more we change the more it is the old, old thing'—might also have been apposite here. The following illustrates the point: Witness—'I think if we could send these (psychopathic) boys to some sort of school, if one cannot get foster homes, where they might be treated kindly, educated and so forth. I think the people who look after them would have to have a lot of patience, but you might do something at that stage to eradicate these antisocial traits.' Chairman—'That is rather a description of an approved school.' Witness—'I do not know, I have not been in approved schools. . . .'

A point raised by the Royal Medico-Psychological Association concerns Sect. 2, Children's Act, 1948, which provides that a local authority may assume the rights and powers of a parent if the latter suffers from some permanent disability preventing proper parental function. If a mother, recently discharged from a mental hospital and perhaps incompletely recovered, challenged such action, the very unsatisfactory situation might arise in which her state of mind must be argued in the juvenile court, evidence heard from both sides and, perhaps, her doctor from the hospital subpoenaed to testify in front of her. The Association recommends that this should be a matter for consideration in private by a judicial authority.

The National Council for Civil Liberties, whose evidence was very outspoken, criticized Sect. 9 of the 1913 M.D. Act. Where a child or young person, under 18, in an approved school or other place of detention by order of a court, is considered subnormal, the child (they suggest) should be sent to a classifying school and thence, if the estimate is confirmed, back to the court which made the original order, before being admitted to a mental deficiency institution. All such admissions should lapse at 18 unless the individual is certified as dangerous or unfit to be at large, or unless the original offence was of 'grave social consequence'. Returning to a classifying school (a measure which sometimes happens at present) seems reasonable, but one wonders whether the juvenile court would be in any better position than the Home Office Inspectorate to assess the suitability of the child for continued training.

The Probation Service. The evidence of the National Association of Probation Officers engenders much sympathy, for the probation officers have to struggle with the failures and rejects of other systems and perforce must 'take on' many individuals whose mental state makes them a very poor risk indeed. In these circumstances it is to their credit that they 'deplore the too ready use of the general term "psychopath" as a diagnosis, and sometimes as a means of dismissing the problem created by the persistently antisocial. . . .' They are fully justified in asking for more help from the mental health services. In particular they hope for more extensive use of medical investigation on bail, earlier ascertainment of the young potential offender, more special classes and special schools, a greater number of fully trained mental health workers, including those who will go out and work with families rather than with individuals, specialized hostels for

subnormal children and for subnormal mothers. They make a special plea for evening clinics so that the patient's work need not be interrupted, and for better publicity about existing facilities. Meanwhile these willing maids-of-all-work say that in the circumstances they 'cannot demur when called upon to undertake duties which might better be undertaken by others'. While mental health services are comparatively advanced in the metropolis and in certain other large cities, some areas are woefully neglected. In making this point, Mr. Frank Dawtry, General Secretary of the Association, stated on good authority that, at the time of his giving evidence, 20 county authorities had no residential facilities, and 21 county boroughs had no day facilities for treating educationally subnormal children, while 23 counties and 26 county boroughs had no child guidance clinics, another example of defect of facilities rather than of the law.

As Miss Willis, probation officer from Somerset, said, the court social worker 'is the liaison officer in many matters'. This being so, the smooth working of much of the relevant legislation depends upon him and he is likely to be the first to detect small weaknesses and loopholes. Since the duty of arranging medical examination for those remanded on bail has fallen upon probation officers, they would like to have proper authority for the task, and suggest an addition to the rules made under the Magistrates' Court Act, 1952. They want the doctor who reports to the court under Sect. 26 of that Act to be the same doctor who, if the court makes the appropriate order, will accept him for treatment; this will avoid the embarrassing situation (in the writer's opinion, most likely to arise when the offender first seeks private psychiatric consultation) in which the hospital psychiatrist soon concludes that the patient is after all unsuitable for treatment, and passes him back to the probation officer. Considering the rather similar situation in which the offender is remanded for psychiatric report to prison, the probation officers wish the report to be made by the 'outside' doctor who is likely to accept the offender for treatment, or at least that this doctor should collaborate with the prison doctor. Thinking along the same lines it is suggested for those offenders who are admitted to a hospital or institution for the purpose of observation or investigation before sentence that the hospital which is prepared to accept them afterwards for treatment (if this proves necessary) should be used. One can scarcely avoid the conclusion that these very reasonable (but administratively difficult) requests are made necessary by differences of opinion and uncertainties amongst medical men. In the gentlest of ways the probation officers request what should be a matter of courtesy, that doctors who are treating probationers should inform the probation officer concerned when a case is discharged or lapses in attendance, and that a comprehensive report should be made when the patient comes back to the probation officer; no doubt they appreciate that breach of confidence is a constant difficulty in these confidential reports. It may be of interest to mention that the Association seems quite prepared to accept that after-care might be carried out by a mental health worker and that if necessary the probation order could be discharged to enable that worker to take on voluntary supervision.

While on the subject of the admission of offenders to hospital as a condition of their probation order, the views of the Magistrates' Association are that 'it should clearly be laid down that a breach of the probation order will have occurred if he does not undergo the treatment required'. The doctors are likely to have mixed feelings about this, fearing perhaps that the court might in effect penalize the

patient for not being a therapeutic success. It should be understood, of course, that 'treatment required' must refer only to remaining in hospital for the period required and not to the nature of the treatment; otherwise it would become an offence for a probationer to refuse leucotomy, or for a Roman Catholic patient to refuse psycho-analysis.

Approved Schools. The associations representing the managers, heads and matrons of approved schools put forward, largely through their most eloquent spokesman, Mr. J. Gittins, a convincing plea for the more rational handling of certain difficult 'subnormal' approved school pupils, a group clearly recognized as very highly selected. Briefly, their argument starts with the approved school boy or girl 'who, for reasons of physical, mental, or character defect is unfitted to cope with normal life in the outside world'. It is stated that the majority of these, while apparently well adjusted in a controlled environment, are capable of only flimsy personal attachments and a shallow emotional life. They lack dependability or sense of responsibility and cannot be left to their own initiative. Many are better able to adjust to a group than to an individual, and some even prefer a 'soul-less institution'. Mr. Gittins included amongst them the 'inadequate personalities or inadequate psychopaths' who are particularly likely to become a drain on society. As an individual such a person, though not consistently vicious or aggressive, is subject from time to time to 'outbursts of what you might almost call frustration by his own futility', and is thus occasionally liable to commit crimes of violence. Obviously such 'subnormality' is particularly likely to lead to disaster if the individual is returned to the unsatisfactory environment which helped to produce the condition. The associations were not concerned to put forward any preconceived idea about the constitution of these children so much as to describe 'the lack of apparent capacity for social adjustment' and to suggest practical measures for dealing with it. They claim that experienced Heads, in different approved schools, are able to recognize, as training progresses, that small but very important proportion of approved school children who become recidivists and commit violent crime. It is stated that '... some 323 children (15.6 per cent. of the total) were licensed with defects that strongly suggested that they would fail. Within three to five years, 151 of them (46.7 per cent.) had failed.' Failure here means that the child is not living a reasonably happy, reasonably efficient, reasonably well-adjusted life; whether they have committed violent crimes, or what sort of violent crime(s) is not indicated.

The existing law enables the managers of approved schools to maintain adequate control of a pupil for the period of training and licence²; during this time they are able, through an after-care officer of their own choosing, to help him effectively and to control where he lives and how he conducts himself; they may even recall him to the school for further training. Thereafter, however, even during the period of statutory supervision, the associations claim that control or supervision is virtually ineffective for these difficult children, especially for the older girls. Further, under Sect. 9 of the M.D. Act, 1913, those approved school

² This period for a child under 14 years is for three years or until 15 and 4 months, whichever is the longer; for a young person over the age of 14½ it is for three years or until 19 years, whichever is the shorter. The period of subsequent supervision is for a further three years, or until 21.

children who prove to be so mentally deficient as to be unable to profit from the training, or are intolerable in the school, may, on the certificates of two doctors and under an order made by the Home Secretary, be sent to a mental deficiency institution. The recommendations of this deputation are that certain approved schools should specialize in dealing with subnormal children. Full details of the capabilities and performance of those subnormal children who are judged, during the course of training, to have poor chances of success on licence, are to be sent to the Home Office in order that the Chief Inspector may decide whether or not to register the child as 'subnormal'. 'The purpose of this registration is two-fold: (i) to focus attention on this particular child and on this class of children generally so that policy in the future can be based on the study of a known population; (ii) to protect the child so that if he gets into trouble subsequently it may be found easier to deal with him under, for example, the Mental Deficiency Acts rather than have him sent to Borstal or to prison.' They recommend that it should be possible, where necessary, to extend the period of licence indefinitely; after the age appropriate to approved school training had been passed 'recall' would be available under the M.D. Act. But instead of a 'mental deficiency hospital' (which, the deputation have observed, may not be suitable for these children and may lead to deterioration rather than to improvement), there should be a colony or community, not necessarily exclusively for ex-approved school children, 'some scheme whereby these youngsters could live on a community basis and be free to work, to earn their living and receive simply the control and support which they require'. This, they feel, is particularly required for those girls who might otherwise become involved in sexual immorality and prostitution. It is suggested that there should be regular reviews to determine the possibility of discharging the child from guardianship or supervision and that the managers would not be averse to the requirements that they should 'petition the court' before such powers could be used.

Registration, they feel, would be more effective with the Home Office than with the local health authorities which have proved 'impenetrable' in the past! Prejudice against indeterminate sentences would be 'theoretical' and would not persist 'because in plain fact these children do come back to the schools again and again for that support; they want it . . . it is something we are happy to provide for somebody who needs it and knows he needs it'. The Chairman enquired as to whether it would not be a hardship for an individual to go through life reminded by his indeterminate supervision that he had once been a delinquent. Mr. T. J. Tucker in his reply implied that a local job, and the community life, would minimize this difficulty, and added: 'I think we should be unrealistic if we did not recognize that a very large number of these girls or boys have made extremely close attachments to the people they have lived with in the approved schools, and it would be far more help to them in an extended period of care to feel they were still in close contact with these people whom they write to regularly.'

At this point the deputation seemed to be giving evidence on a type of pupil far different from that outlined in their general description of 'subnormals' who were said to have flimsy attachments to individuals and a 'shallow' emotional life. This reinforced a growing impression that the 'subnormal', in the absence of a definition or full description, were being regarded too much as a definite

entity and that prediction of their future failure, and especially of their future violence, might possibly be much over-rated. Another difficulty in trying to assess how this scheme might work is the generally accepted fact that after-care, as it exists, is so inefficient. Thus the scheme, which experience suggests is much needed for some particularly difficult individuals, might be unnecessarily applied to those who would be capable of satisfactory adjustment under ordinary after-care if that after-care were to be as efficient as possible. A third point is that, since ascertainment of the 'subnormal' is to take place within the approved school system, it may come to include (especially if the scheme were operated by less experienced Heads) pupils who were mainly reacting to a régime which did not suit them.

Nevertheless these doubts do not obscure the fact of the distressing graduation of some children from approved schools to Borstal institutions and prisons, and that no one else seems to have put forward constructive plans to prevent it. This scheme, devised by very experienced people, seems a well-considered attempt to deal with a difficult problem and is worthy of careful attention.

The Psychopathic Offender. The paramount question at first seemed to be whether the existing 'arrested or incomplete development of mind' of the 1927 Mental Deficiency Act should include those whose intellectual development was adequate but whose emotional or 'character' development was not. If the latter view were to be taken, as favoured by the Ministry of Health and Board of Control, then many psychopaths could readily be controlled without new legislation; yet, at the same time, there would inevitably be a great risk of casting the net 'so wide that everyone who is anti-social in any kind of way becomes a mental defective'; and this at a time when the general feeling is that there is too much institutionalism and compulsion in the field of mental deficiency. Although opinion was sharply divided on this question, it soon lost much of its importance as it became obvious that the real bone of contention was not whether the 'defective' of normal intelligence should come under legislation but in what category and in what sort of institution. Taking the Ministry of Health and Board of Control as representing one view and the Royal College of Physicians the other, both quite clearly recommend that certain anti-social individuals should be dealt with in institutions and segregated from low-grade defectives, so that their differences of opinion are largely nominal.

The question of how to define these psychopaths remained. More witnesses were prepared to describe aspects of psychopathy than risked a definition of a psychopath. The well-known qualities—incapacity to benefit from experience, incorrigibility, lack of guilt concerning their behaviour, a history of trouble in childhood (often with sadistic tendencies), graduation through approved schools and Borstals, upbringing in orphanages from broken homes, embittered feelings, no social conscience, failure to make use of school, refusal to work, resorting to violence to attain their ends, unsatisfactory marriages—are none of them pathognomonic, nor is it known that they always occur together sufficiently consistently to make diagnosis or prediction feasible. It commonly happened that an initial description of one sort of psychopath (or group of psychopaths), for instance the aggressive psychopaths, would, in discussion, be enlarged to include many other sorts. So often the abnormalities seemed to be quantitative rather than qualitative, and, there being no yardstick, they eluded definition. It did not seem

possible to differentiate psychopaths from those who are persistently 'socially inefficient'—which, as the Chairman said, means in simple English 'people who are unable to look after themselves and have not got anybody to look after them', or persons 'who do not possess for one reason or another the degree of self-control appropriate to their age'.

It became puzzling, as the various opinions and recommendations were made, why nearly all the witnesses categorically rejected the existing term 'moral defective', 'that is to say, persons in whose case there exists mental defectiveness coupled with strongly vicious or criminal propensities and who require care, supervision and control for the protection of others', although this seemed to describe exactly what they wished to deal with. Indeed, one of the Royal Commissioners received an affirmative answer to his question: 'If you removed moral defectives from the definition altogether, would not psychopaths become moral defectives?' Dr. Walk (Royal Medico-Psychological Association), an authority on the history of the relevant legislation, settled this question by pointing out that the problem of the psychopath is not a new one and was in fact dealt with at length by the Radnor Commission of 1904-8; he traced the origin and varying meanings of the term and concluded: 'We feel that by now the concept of moral deficiency is really dead, there is no possibility of reviving it and clearing up these misunderstandings, and we would like to make a fresh start on this whole problem under the head of "psychopathic personalities".'

Many witnesses, in vigorously preaching that social insufficiency should be regarded as the main criterion of mental deficiency, were clearly addressing the converted, for, as one of the Commissioners (Dr. Thomas) inferred, the present definitions are already 'entirely based upon social inefficiency'. Indeed, the extent to which the higher-grade patients are admitted to our present mental deficiency institutions primarily because of their criminality or psychopathy may come as a surprise to many. One of the witnesses for the Confederation of Health Service Employees stated that in his institution 'roughly 40 per cent. come from police courts', and Dr. Kirman (Socialist Medical Association) said: 'If we take as a guide a series of fairly recent admissions to mental deficiency hospitals, taking only the feeble-minded, nearly half of these are of normal intelligence and the reason why they are admitted is usually because of the social difficulties they have got into.' Sir Frederick Armer said: 'What brings the patient under notice is antisocial behaviour rather than anything else.' The same theme is repeated by Professor Lewis: 'It seems to me that the high-grade defective only gets into an institution, and probably is only ascertained and dealt with under statutory provision, if he has committed an antisocial act.' Relevant here is Professor Penrose's³ finding that in different communities the percentage of the population in prisons and in mental deficiency institutions varies inversely.

There is an even greater uniformity of opinion that lumping together a great variety of defectives in over-crowded and understaffed institutions is thoroughly undesirable and in practice as likely to hinder as to help the individual patient. To quote Dr. Hilliard's authoritative opinion: 'I think the National Association (for Mental Health) feels that the problem to-day in mental deficiency institutions

³ L. S. Penrose. 'The Biology of Mental Defect.' Sidgwick & Jackson, 1949, p. 210.

is that they have too many different categories of patients all with the same label.' The Institution of Hospital Administrators further draws attention to the great overcrowding and shortage of nursing staff.

Apart from those who simply want to wash their hands of the psychopath, witnesses, as well as to some extent members of the Commission, seem to adopt two approaches. Some did their best to devise, or expected, a workable definition, while others accepted defeat as to definition but nevertheless hoped to deal constructively with the problem. It may be stated straight away that, of the several definitions, none offered any appreciable advance on Norwood East's definition of the criminal psychopath as 'a person who, although not insane, psycho-neurotic or mentally defective, is persistently unable to adapt himself to social requirements on account of abnormal peculiarities of impulse, temperament and character which may require specialized medical and rehabilitative treatment instead of, or in addition to, the ordinary methods of punishment before his social reclamation can be effected'.⁴ The positive and operative part of the definition lies in observable or recorded *behaviour*, but, as the Chairman said, 'I have never seen a general definition of a psychopath by behaviour, when the behaviour was not also observable in somebody who was not a psychopath.'

There was a good deal of pressure on the psychiatrists to produce a medical definition of what is largely a social matter. With all his experience, Dr. Maxwell Jones finds it 'completely impossible to make a definition' and considers 'that there is more hope of finding a definition related to social behaviour than to psychiatric classification'. Sir Cecil Oakes (Royal Commissioner) made the hopeful suggestion: 'Would it not meet your case a little better not to have a definition but to have an inclusive term which would include and not define? That is a modern practice now in matters quite as precise as this, and flexibility of that kind is infinitely easier for laymen to interpret than a precise definition based on knowledge which they can never possess'; and later he said: 'Instead of making a definition you could give guidance. It need not necessarily be a definition; guidance—a thing Ministers particularly like to do in regard to Regulations—is a very good way of dealing with such problems.' Also hopeful is the fact that Sect. 4, Criminal Justice Act, 1948, successfully deals with offenders who are 'susceptible to treatment', and not certifiable, without any attempt at definition or even description of their mental state.

Many witnesses, impressed by the dangerousness to society of some psychopaths who have already committed serious crime, seek powers to deal with them compulsorily if they fail to accept voluntary treatment. Most suggested an extension of the powers of criminal courts after the style of Sect. 30, Magistrates' Courts Act of 1952, or of Sect. 8 of the Mental Deficiency Act, 1913, to enable the court on medical advice to send certain offenders to special institutions. As an additional safeguard it has been suggested that the medical witnesses to the court should be particularly experienced in this speciality. The National Association for Mental Health requires one of the psychiatrists to be appointed by the Home Office.

Limitation of space prohibits description of the smaller differences in the various schemes suggested. The memoranda from the R.M.P.A., B.M.A.,

⁴ Sir Norwood East. 'Society and the Criminal.' London: H.M.S.O., p. 41.

N.A.M.H., South-West Regional Hospital Board, R.C.P., and from Dr. Maxwell Jones and Dr. Heaton Ward, deal most fully with this particular problem. The first five of these memoranda go further than others in attempting to tackle not only the psychopath who is willing to accept treatment voluntarily, the psychopath who, having already proved himself dangerous to society by committing an offence, is to be referred compulsorily by the courts for institutional treatment, but also that third group of psychopaths who are not technically offenders but cause misery to others, especially their children, by repeated minor acts of cruelty, or who become tramps, vagabonds, alcohol or drug addicts. The R.M.P.A. suggests that the procedure in such cases should involve a petition, two medical recommendations and an examination by an independent specialist, ordered by the court. Despite this 'daring' suggestion all the witnesses, with the exception of the approved school deputation, Dr. Heaton Ward and possibly the Magistrates' Association (who call for 'something in the way of an indeterminate sentence', yet elsewhere in their memorandum reject the Danish system and its sentences) fight shy of the indeterminate sentence, preferring to fall back upon limited sentences (often with a minimum of two years) with power to renew. Even so, if these powers were put into effect, they might have consequences for recidivists more serious than the present preventive detention.

As to what is to be done with the psychopath, once he is made available, nearly all agree that separate and specialized institutions are required at least for some of them, and most insert a clause that the new powers should not be implemented until such accommodation is available. The R.M.P.A. specify the following new, national or regional, establishments—one or more on the lines of a colony, with a régime and a lay disciplinary control and psychiatric advice and treatment; one or more of the Belmont unit type; some on purely medical lines for the treatment of alcoholism and drug addiction. Professor Lewis envisages a new sort of mental deficiency institution for the reception of high-grade defectives and psychopaths of average intelligence which 'would have to provide social amenities and would have to be located near an industrial community; it would have workshops and psycho-therapeutic facilities and you would have to recruit a different and larger number of grades of ancillary staff than is done at present. The whole situation would be changed.'

Dr. Maxwell Jones, from his experience at Belmont Social Rehabilitation Unit, outlined the promising results obtained through his principles of community living and group treatment, with the participation of a team of specially trained social therapists. He suggests that 'in those cases where no known crime has been committed but where the social problem is such that segregation and/or treatment seems to be called for these powers of temporary confinement for the purpose of adequate investigation might be considered'. At the end of a compulsory stay of three weeks in the unit some might remain for further treatment and others prefer to go home; of the latter some might need to be compulsorily transferred to a closed psychopathic hospital.

It seems inevitable that little can be known about the treatment of the more aggressive and evasive psychopaths, for, except perhaps in such institutions as Broadmoor and Rampton, they do not stay long enough to be properly studied. The absence of any evidence from these institutions and from the prison authorities (so far) is much to be regretted.

Beside the more sweeping suggestions for clearing up the psychopathic problem were more conservative views, for example, those of the Institute for the Study and Treatment of Delinquency which, while recommending special security hospitals for a minority of really difficult adult and juvenile offenders, also stressed that innovations might in effect condone inefficiency capable of correction in existing establishments, and that the clamour for 'authority' to absorb social problems must be tempered. It was suggested that incorrigible criminals can be divided into nuisances and menaces; society must be encouraged to tolerate the former without locking them away.

The important conclusion which emerges from all this evidence is that an increasing weight of opinion favours the treatment of psychopathic offenders, if necessary under compulsion, in a variety of special institutions which shall resemble hospitals rather than prisons; some go further and try to reach the probably small group of psychopathic non-offenders. The difficulties and dangers of so doing are clearly realized, especially as it has not been possible adequately to define the psychopath—a difficulty which seems to arise from the customary insistence on seeking a psychiatric definition of what is obviously largely a social problem. Indeterminate committal is not much favoured, but the envisaged renewal of orders comes close to it. Suggested additional safeguards include a special form of petition, a more elaborate judicial authority, more experienced psychiatric opinion, a single national appeals tribunal to secure uniformity in the standards of certification, compulsory review at stated intervals. Apart from the small 'third' group of (non-offending) psychopaths, there are no startlingly new powers envisaged and it is perfectly clear that any improvements which might result will be as much through the clarification of existing practices, and the reorientation and improvement of existing facilities, as through the provisions of new legislation. It is, of course, important to realize that legislation alone can be expected to play only a small part in so wide and ill-defined a problem as that of the psychopath. Whatever the recommendations of the Royal Commission, the discussion of such a difficult and obscure problem is bound to be of value in helping to inform public opinion.

PETER D. SCOTT.

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST CAPITAL PUNISHMENT : RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

In our symposium in January 1954 on the Report of the Royal Commission, we wrote: 'Whether the recommendations of the Report will be accepted or not, there can be no doubt that the work of the Royal Commission has produced fresh evidence in favour of total abolition and represents nothing but another step towards this final goal.' A year later, in April 1955, when a motion to suspend capital punishment for five years had been defeated in the House of Commons by 245 to 214 votes, we said in our Editorial: 'The debate has done nothing to weaken our conviction that, whether or not the recommendations of the Royal Commission will be accepted, sooner or later abolition is bound to come.' It is not the object of this short Note to review afresh any of the arguments *pro* and *contra*, but only to present in a nutshell to our readers, in particular those abroad, the main features of subsequent developments in this age-long struggle.

In summer 1955, a new body, called 'National Campaign for the Abolition of Capital Punishment,' was formed in London, which has been very active organizing meetings throughout the country and producing abolitionist literature. In November 1955, the Home Secretary announced that the Government were not prepared to accept any of the major recommendations of the Royal Commission (*Hansard*, 10th November, 1955). In the same month, a Labour Member, Mr. Sydney Silverman, introduced a private member's bill to abolish or suspend capital punishment. In January 1956, three men sentenced in January 1954 to terms of ten, seven and four years' imprisonment respectively for causing grievous bodily harm to a police constable were granted 'free pardons' on the ground of mistaken identity (*Hansard*, 24th January, 1956). In the same month, the Inns of Court Conservative and Unionist Society published a report, in which, as *The Times* expressed it, 'as a middle way between the two extremes of the present law and complete abolition of the death penalty,' certain reforms of the English law of murder were recommended, in particular in relation to the doctrine of 'constructive malice' and the law of provocation. In February 1956, the Government introduced a bill to retain the death penalty, but to amend the law of murder, largely on the lines indicated in that report. This bill was debated in the House of Commons on the 16th February, 1956 and defeated, on a free vote, by 293 against 262 votes. Another motion, introduced by a former Home Secretary, Mr. Chuter Ede, 'that the death penalty for murder no longer accords with the needs or the true interests of a civilized society, and calls upon Her Majesty's Government to introduce forthwith legislation for its abolition or for its suspension for an experimental period' was carried by 292 against 246 votes, and the Prime Minister stated that 'the Government will give full weight at once to a decision taken by this House on a free vote. . . .' (*Hansard*, 16th February, 1956). The Government thereupon decided to give the necessary facilities for a second reading of Mr. Silverman's private bill, with a free vote, and this bill, in the terms of Mr. Ede's motion, was adopted by 286 against 262 votes (*Hansard*, 12th March, 1956).

There the matter rests for the moment. What will be the fate of the bill in the third reading and afterwards in the House of Lords it is impossible to foresee. It has to be remembered that a similar bill was carried in the House of Commons in 1948, but defeated in the House of Lords. To a large extent, the fate of the present bill will depend on whether, as Mr. Herbert Morrison suggested (*Hansard*, 16th February, 1956, column 2,584), 'between 1948 and 1956 there has been a change in public opinion in favour of abolition or suspension' and, if this should be true, whether this change has already become strong enough to overcome the widespread resistance and apprehension which undoubtedly still exist.

H. M.

CRITICAL NOTICES

HOMOSEXUALITY AND PROSTITUTION. (London: British Medical Association. Pp. 94. 2s. 6d. net.)

The publication of a memorandum prepared by a special committee of the Council of the British Medical Association for submission to the Departmental Committee on Homosexuality and Prostitution gives rise to an intriguing situation, viz., that evidence given by one professional organization is open to review in the official organ of another (in this case the I.S.T.D.) which itself has submitted a memorandum to and given evidence before the Departmental Committee. Yet although argument between witnesses is under ordinary circumstances rarely edifying, the issues on this occasion are too important to justify abstention from comment.

To the largest part of this document no exception can be taken. In the absence of adequate statistical records and researches, it presents reliable and, with some exceptions which will be discussed later, enlightened professional opinions on the two subjects. Needless to say, the opinions on homosexuality are much more expansive than those on prostitution; a not surprising state of affairs since the reactions of medical practitioners and psychiatrists to the subject of prostitution are based for the most part on memories, first-hand or vicarious, of their salad days as medical students. Prostitutes, it is interesting to note, do not feel the same need to frequent psychiatric consulting rooms as do some 'conflicted' active homosexuals. And in any case the opinions of most medical practitioners on sexual mores are not much more objective than those of the lay citizen—and that is not saying a great deal.

One of the best sections of the memorandum is that on the incidence of homosexuality. This is both cautious and temperate. And the same may be said of the section on etiology, with one reservation, however (and this applies also to the section on treatment), that the Committee have based their views on a somewhat confused classification which both diagnostically and therapeutically obscures the issue. A distinction is drawn between an 'essential' group, whose homosexuality is *either* genetically determined *or* caused by environmental influences in very early life, and an 'acquired' group where the tendency to homosexual practices is 'predominantly determined by *new* (reviewer's italics) factors arising in later childhood, adolescence or adult life'. This runs counter to the views of those who consider that early developmental factors exist and operate in *all* cases, and who attribute this predisposition as much to unconscious (endopsychic) reactions as to purely environmental influences. The Committee tacitly admits the validity of this criticism when it gives first place amongst the ways of 'acquiring' homosexual habits to 'the continuance in adult life of school-boy or school-girl habit'. The disadvantages of this classification are more apparent when one reads the section on treatment, where the distinction between 'essential' and 'acquired' is allowed to lapse and a fresh, but equally confusing clinical (prognostic) classification is substituted. The policy of the I.S.T.D. committee was to distinguish between organized homosexuals (by far the larger group) in which no apparent sign of conflict can be determined and those 'pathological' homosexuals in whom a conflict factor is present rendering them more amenable to therapeutic procedure;

where, in fact, the homosexuality can be regarded as an 'equivalent' of neurotic, alcoholic or psychotic disturbance. It is true that in both groups the possibility exists of bringing to bear influences which will lead to 'control' of the impulses, a control incidentally necessitated largely by existing penal codes. Even so, control is more easily acquired in the 'pathological' or 'conflicted' group, obsessional types always excepted. In most 'non-conflicted' homosexuals, 'control' is limited to 'discretion' so that the individual in question appears neither in the consulting room nor in the law court. Incidentally there is one passage in the etiology section which deserves to be italicized, namely, the paragraph in which Professor Penrose's beliefs are quoted, viz., that variation in sexual traits is 'probably of degree rather than of kind' and that 'in the great majority of cases of homosexuality the condition is not abnormal, but an example of a natural and probably inevitable type of biological variation'. This view, qualified, it is true, by stress laid on the significance in all cases of developmental predispositional factors in early childhood, was also advanced in the I.S.T.D. memorandum. 'Homosexuality', said the I.S.T.D. report, giving way for once to the temptation to generalize, 'is either a natural deviation or a mental disorder'.

Apropos the treatment of homosexuality one further comment is legitimate. The B.M.A. Committee, quite naturally, suggests that the homosexual may be treated by his family doctor. This is a somewhat sanguine view which is not shared by the majority of those homosexuals who are prepared to seek for treatment. General practitioners are not trained to handle sexual difficulties, though no doubt if they were one might fairly anticipate a considerable strengthening of diagnostic facilities. Incidentally, it might have been well to insist that prison doctors should also be trained to deal with suitable cases.

These are, however, relatively minor matters by comparison with what might be described as the main socio-legal tendency of the B.M.A. memorandum. In the introductory section, in the section describing homosexual persons and their practices, in fact running throughout the booklet, there occur phrases which either directly or by implication indicate an attitude condemnatory of the practice of homosexuality. Some of the more censorious of these might well have been coined by the grandmother of Mr. Chadband: 'moral dangers of illicit sexual activity', 'weakening of responsibility with regard to social and national welfare', 'debauched persons' seeking 'new sensations for their jaded appetites', 'repulsive practices', 'degenerate sodomists', 'outrage to public decency'. Such phrases contrast strangely with the more temperate conception of 'essential homosexuality' or for the matter of that with the Committee's statement, that practising homosexuals are to be found in the Church, Parliament, Civil Service, Press, Radio, Stage and other institutions.

A more oblique indication of this bias is to be found in the sections on prevention, treatment and the law: 'incurrable offenders', 'the law needs to be both deterrent and reformatory', existing laws 'help to create a public opinion against them' (homosexual practices), 'the real safeguard . . . is public opinion', 'provisions for athletic activities . . . promote a healthy atmosphere in which homosexual practices have no place'. Who are the 'incurrable' homosexuals but that large body of organized (essential) homosexuals who exercise discretion and therefore do not come in conflict with the law and who, in general social and ethical respects, have a higher code of behaviour than the general population?

Is not public opinion in this matter largely governed by the prejudiced reactions either of 'heartly heterosexuals' or of weakly organized heterosexuals whose unconscious homosexuality gives rise to antagonism towards and contempt of overt homosexuality? Are not a significant number of 'nature and body culture' enthusiasts, pugilists, footballers and wrestlers themselves homosexual?

Leaving these points unanswered, we may note that the question of removing from the calendar of offences the commission in privacy of homosexual acts between consenting adults is discussed in a manner which gives no indication of the Committee's views on this policy except the negative one that they pointedly abstain from directly recommending this alteration in the law. The Committee of the Magistrates' Association showed in this respect a higher degree of moral courage.

In this connection it is interesting to compare the Committee's reactions to male homosexuality with those expressed regarding female homosexuality. This latter section of the memorandum was prepared by a special sub-committee which dealt also with the problem of prostitution: and exhibits a markedly different tone. Female homosexuality, it is averred, constitutes no social problem, is not readily amenable to therapeutic measures and is better left alone. Since from the clinical point of view *unconscious* female homosexuality gives rise in many cases to severe mental disturbances, in the same way as *unconscious* male homosexuality gives rise in many cases to mental disorders, it would be interesting to know how far the fact that overt female homosexuality does not constitute a social problem is due to the absence of penological measures.

Finally, on the subject of prostitution: apart from expressing social concern as to certain aspects of this problem and recommending increase in fines, the report is in effect non-committal. The remedial and mostly social measures suggested are such as might be recommended for the prevention of any form of behaviour disorder. Unenterprising as are the Committee's suggestions, it is perhaps just as well to be non-committal about a problem concerning which so little is known. There is no hope of applying specific measures until an adequate classification of prostitutes is arrived at on the basis of controlled research. Although the term 'essential' is misleading, it is important to ascertain what proportion of courtesans are 'essential' prostitutes. And, as in the case of homosexuality, it is also important to measure the extent of 'discreet' prostitution, including demimondaines, gold-diggers and 'professional' wives. Perhaps, again as in the case of homosexuality, the Law should be recommended to confine its attention in the meantime to those anti-social practices associated with prostitution which merit the appellation criminal in the purely social sense of the term. Most writers on prostitution are carried away by sexual prejudice and refuse to face this question of the 'essential' prostitute. In this respect it is to be hoped that the recommendations of the Departmental Committee will show the community a 'good' (unprejudiced) example.

E. G.

GROUP PROBLEMS IN CRIME AND PUNISHMENT. By Hermann Mannheim. (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Limited. 1955. Pp. ix + 309. 28s.)

Those among us who call ourselves criminologists have become used to expecting provocative, erudite and well-systematized thinking in the work of Professor Mannheim. This new volume, containing essays and reviews over the past twenty

years, continues this high level of scholarship. Many of the previously published essays have been uniquely brought up-to-date with additional references and notes. About his own approach, Professor Mannheim states that he is 'neither a psychologist nor psychiatrist or statistician. I might probably describe myself as a cross between a lawyer and a crimino-sociologist' or, as he adds, 'a sociological criminologist if this should sound better' (129). There are discussions of 'group problems' in many areas such as crime and punishment, criminology and its methods, criminal law, capital punishment, short-term imprisonment, and also impressions of American criminology and prisons resulting from his visit in 1953. This variety of topics, sociological and legal, he justifies as a result of the fact that 'a process of drawing nearer is slowly taking place between the legal and the sociological-penological ways of approach to problems of crime, a process which greatly facilitates mutual understanding' (VII).

In the reviewer's opinion, criminological literature tends to be characterized either by extreme doctrinaire approaches or by a weak multiple factor eclecticism which results from having no theory of human behaviour at all. Neither of these approaches has resulted in valid knowledge and, as Professor Mannheim states, 'In hardly any other branch of knowledge has it happened so often as in our field that apparently firmly established theories had to be abandoned as fallacious or at least one-sided' (118). Professor Mannheim does not fall into such a trap even though there is, throughout, an emphasis on the group aspects of human behaviour. Not only does he indicate a sympathetic awareness of approaches with which he disagrees, but he is not afraid of the subversive literature of another discipline. As he says, 'it is often ignorance of what others are doing or might be capable of contributing that creates the subjective feeling of one's own superiority and prevents real team work' (138). He feels that 'one of the real tragedies in the field of criminological research is the prevailing lack of co-operation and understanding between psychologists, psychiatrists, sociologists, statisticians, and lawyers' (138). Integration of interdisciplinary approaches, in the reviewer's opinion, however, must be based on some agreement about personality and learning. The same basic conceptions of personality and learning must apply to criminal and non-criminal behaviour. In his desire to have more harmonious relations between the various disciplines interested in criminology, Professor Mannheim does not always recognize this need for agreement on basic concepts.

According to Professor Mannheim, criminology is still largely national or regional in scope, and there is little common language or joint discussion of common problems. Most American and European criminologists are largely unfamiliar with each other's work which tends, primarily, to be sociological in America and largely individualistic in Europe. Fortunately, the fact that he adopts an inter-disciplinary approach and cites bibliographical sources from many countries, gives his writings something of the characteristics of an international criminology. However, he constantly raises the issue as to whether this or that finding necessarily applies to other countries.

Criminology is concerned not only with behaviour which is illegal, but also behaviour which is anti-social. In this connection he acknowledges on several occasions the concept of social norms as used by Thorsten Sellin.¹ He makes the

¹ Thorsten Sellin, *Culture Conflict and Crime* (New York : Social Science Research Council, 1938).

point that 'it is only by making criminology in this way independent of the criminal law that it can be used to prepare the ground for changes in the law by collecting material which may show that forms of anti-social behaviour so far ignored by the legislator should in fact be treated as offences' (263). He thinks that this is now taking place in penology in the study of probation which, at least in the United Kingdom, is no longer regarded as punishment, as well as the study of non-punitive psychological treatment methods.

On the other hand, criminology, to which he would add penology, must be distinguished from three other disciplines which cover the field of crime: the scientific study of the criminal law, the sociology of the criminal law and, finally, a field which has no real English equivalent for the German 'Kriminalpolitik' and the French 'politique criminelle'. The sociology of the criminal law he sees as a discipline which examines the influence upon the criminal law of the structure of society, the position of various groups and institutions as well as the values and attitudes of different groups within a population and how, for example, they may influence legislation. According to Professor Mannheim, criminology studies conditions leading to crime, whereas the sociology of law studies conditions leading to legislation. No satisfactory answers can be given to the adequacy or scope of a given law without the 'sociological analysis of the values and attitudes of present-day society' (279). Law is but one form of social control, the individual is related to others in society, and modern society has mass characteristics. In his book on *Criminal Justice and Social Reconstruction* he took up many of these issues. In these essays he adds a discussion of some issues not previously covered such as those involved in collective responsibility and collective punishment, war-time collaboration with the enemy, the international offence of genocide, the changed nature of political corruption and attitudes toward adultery in contemporary society and, finally, the issue of artificial insemination. One interesting aspect with which he deals is the failure of the criminal law to recognize sufficiently the mass element in considerable criminal behaviour in modern society. Such mass offences as stealing from factories or docks may involve no complicity or conspiracy although they may arise from a similar situation. The common element in these offences must be recognized, as it has been by several Dutch judges, if we are to deal successfully, either by prevention or punishment, with such types of offences.

What is needed in contemporary criminology is not necessarily more information but more reliable information. This means research on more representative samples, using more adequate groups, the necessity for the researcher to make more careful analysis of his data, and the avoidance of personal bias. In three essays dealing with war and crime, a subject about which he is probably the outstanding authority, Professor Mannheim demonstrates some of the need for more reliable information in this area. While the use of control groups of non-delinquents or criminals is indispensable in any research, there are several difficulties. There may not be distinguishing characteristics between the two groups; it is often difficult to obtain as reliable information about the control group; control group studies are bound to be static rather than taking adequate account of the entire life, and finally the frequency in two groups of various factors may lead to splitting the human personality into such a large number of segments that the individual as a whole may have little meaning. These cautions must be kept in mind in much current research in juvenile delinquency and criminality.

In 'The Sociological Study of the Adult Offender' Professor Mannheim distinguishes between the approach of social workers who are frequently used in correctional work and that of sociologists whom he feels must fight for their status in such an applied area. The social worker, like the psychologist and psychiatrist, approaches the problem of delinquency or crime through the observation of the individual emphasizing personality traits and family influences. There is need, he feels, for the sociological study of other groups such as the play group, neighbourhood and occupation, and the influence on the family of such groups. Although the sociologist can contribute to areas neglected by social work, it seems to the reviewer that Professor Mannheim misses the important question of whether there should necessarily exist any differences in the theoretical approach between them. Providing social workers receive needed training in group or sociological as well as other approaches to behaviour, although leaving the individualistic approach more to psychiatrists and psychologists, there would be little necessity for the sociologist to work in such an applied area. Sociologists as such have traditionally not been involved to any extent in treatment situations and thus there will be considerable difficulty in using them in 'expert' situations.

Being an American, the reviewer cannot avoid noting briefly several of Professor Mannheim's observations about American criminality and criminology. More than most Europeans, he notes and is sympathetic with some of the problems America faces because of its size, the diversity of administrative practices, and the extensive mobility of the population. Such extremes exist in the treatment of crime that it is difficult to refer to typical practices in an entity so heterogeneous as the United States. While criticizing many of the actual correctional situations he observed, he feels that American criminologists in their research tend to lead rather than follow public opinion. In particular, he praises them for their courage in doing research on such unpopular subjects as disproving public opinion that criminality is related to certain immigrant or racial groups and also the study of white collar criminality involving as it does the study of persons in position of high status and power.

With most of what Professor Mannheim says one will either agree beforehand or be overcome by the force of the argument. It seems, however, that he uses, as do so many criminologists, the term 'crime' and 'delinquency', 'criminals', and 'delinquents' as though they were more homogeneous entities than they actually are. Without a distinction between types of offenders such as individual and social, between offenders in which personality disturbances play a major rôle and those in which cultural and group factors are of major importance, some conclusions are left unclear as to what type of criminal behaviour is referred to and what is not.

Among the most stimulating essays is that dealing with 'Lombroso and His Place in Modern Criminology'. In it he traces the development of Lombroso's writings and evaluates modern criminobiology. While some have felt that Lombroso has been repudiated, he feels that 'we are rather confronted with a gradual process of partial abandonment, partial retention and improvement of his methods and results' (84). Having said this, Professor Mannheim in this and other essays leaves no doubt about his essential disagreement with the findings of criminobiology on both theoretical and methodological grounds as well as the contradictory nature of many of the findings.

MARSHALL B. CLINARD.
Professor of Sociology, University of Wisconsin.

REVIEWS

PREDICTION METHODS IN RELATION TO BORSTAL TRAINING. By Hermann Mannheim and Leslie T. Wilkins. (H.M. Stationery Office. 1955. Pp. viii + 276. 17s. 6d.)

In 1948 the Criminal Justice Act gave the Secretary of State for the Home Department a power, which he had not previously possessed, to incur expenditure 'in the conduct of research into the causes of delinquency and the treatment of offenders'. With this authorization a number of investigations were set on foot; and the book which Dr. Mannheim and Mr. Wilkins have written is announced as the first of a series of such 'Studies'. In other countries inquiries into the problems of delinquency have commonly been based either on case histories, collected and collated by clinical psychologists, or else on a quantitative analysis of tabulated records undertaken by a statistician. It has been the special aim of most British investigators to combine both these complementary methods, and so secure the special advantages of each, while overcoming, or endeavouring to overcome, their limitations when used in isolation. The present report is the outcome of a co-operative study carried out by an experienced criminologist and a statistical expert, 'working together as a team'.

Their primary purpose was to ascertain how far it would be practicable to construct simple 'prediction or experience tables' of the kind now widely used, both in the United States and in Europe, and use them for estimating the likelihood of success or failure in the case of youths sentenced to training at a Borstal institution. The previous records and the subsequent careers of 700 such youths were subjected to a systematic analysis. A weighting coefficient was derived for each of the items recorded; and a graph drawn up for deducing the probability of success from the weighted assessments thus computed. On comparing the 'predictions' so obtained with the subsequent careers of the lads in the same sample, the authors obtained a correlation of 0.50 when behaviour during detention was included in the data, and 0.46 when it was not. 'If', they say, 'we were to separate the youths into "sheep" and "goats" and leave the centre (*i.e.* the doubtful or intermediate) group unclassified . . . we should be right in 77 per cent. of the cases. This would be 53 per cent. better than chance'. If all were classified (including the intermediate group), the predictions would be 38 per cent. better than chance, as compared with the '12 per cent. improvement secured by . . . Governors' or Housemasters' prognoses'.

But of course, as the writers are careful to point out, when used for the *same* sample, the so-called 'prediction tables' are not providing 'predictions' in the strict sense of the term. The after-histories of the lads were already known, and supplied the original criterion on which the 'prediction equations' were based. Obviously the only fair way to validate such equations is to apply them to an entirely new batch. This was done; and the results were distinctly encouraging. The correlation, 0.48, remained much the same as before. Unfortunately 'two-stage prediction' was no longer possible; nevertheless, 'the overall success rate for the validation study was 49 per cent., as compared with 45 per cent. for the total original sample or 57 per cent. for the sample from which the tables were derived'.

In addition to the statistical analysis, which forms the body of the work, the report includes much supplementary material of great interest to the criminologist—a collection of individual case-studies drawn from the five main ‘success categories’, an inquiry into the relative merits of the ‘open’ and ‘closed’ type of Borstal institution, a ‘historical survey of prediction studies’, supplemented by a critical appraisal of the investigations of Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck and other leading investigators, and a concluding chapter on ‘the future of criminological research’. If the later volumes of ‘Studies’ are as excellent as the first, they will furnish a most valuable contribution to our knowledge of delinquency, and will fully justify the decision of the Home Office to embark on a series of scientific inquiries.

SIR CYRIL BURT.

THE PREVENTION OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN SELECTED EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.
(United Nations. ST/SOA/SD/6. April 1955. Pp. iv + 156. 9s. stg. or equivalent in other currencies).

This useful survey of delinquency prevention methods has a special claim on the attention of readers of the Journal. The report has been prepared by the I.S.T.D. for the First United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders at the request of the Secretariat of the United Nations. The central theme of the survey is the difficult concept of pre-delinquency. The method used in the preparation of the report is that of the questionnaire with all its usual handicaps and weaknesses.

The questionnaire in five parts was submitted to individuals, competent institutions and governmental agencies in twenty-seven countries. Complete replies were received from eight countries and incomplete replies from a further eleven countries. The bulk of the material collected covers prevention measures in the medico-psychological, educational and social fields. There are also short sections dealing with the legal provisions and the organization of research. The report concludes with a helpful bibliography.

The report is described as a preliminary or pilot survey. Considered as such it is a most successful document and the I.S.T.D. has completed a difficult job with clarity and precision. After reading it, however, the reader finds himself reflecting on the nature of the concept and the adequacy of our knowledge of the problem. First, there is the dislike of the concept on the part of lawyers. To label a child as pre-delinquent, it is often argued, is to stigmatize him before the actual commission of a crime. We can only hope that continued progress in the non-penal treatment of the delinquent will soften this objection since early prevention is an important need. Second, there is the wide gap between the recent development of prediction techniques and the inadequate information on the actual effect of preventive measures. We still suffer from a scarcity of material on the results of treatment procedures whether in the institutional or environmental field. Third, we notice the serious shortage of skilled workers and particularly of psychiatrists in all the countries under review. It may well be that we ought to experiment still more in methods for the extension of mental health knowledge in these areas. The experience of Israel faced with a host of problems and a scarcity of workers is of special relevance.

In looking to the future the report very wisely observes how brief is the history of multi-disciplinary collaboration and how much work still remains to be done. We still await the growth of carefully-controlled experiment in a variety of cultural backgrounds. We still need to learn more about delinquency prevention with that minority of children suffering from more serious character disorders. It is nevertheless encouraging to read in this report of solid achievement in so many different countries in recent years.

JOHN SPENCER.

DELINQUENT BOYS. *The Culture of the Gang*. By Albert K. Cohen. (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press. 1955. Pp. 202. \$3.50.)

The chief objective of Professor Cohen's book, one might almost say his ruling passion, is to set the gang of juvenile delinquents in its proper frame, the world outside. Discussing subcultures in general, and the delinquent subculture, the culture of the gang, in particular, he is always at pains to keep in mind the whole—the context—the universal status of the group discussed. If we wish to control, he says, we must understand, not so much why individuals join existing gangs—the psychiatrists, he suggests, have worked overtime on that question—but why such gangs exist, and must be accepted as part of our social fabric. The delinquent subculture, he claims, is itself a positive code with a definite if unconventional moral flavour, and it demands—and amply gets, from Professor Cohen—a positive explanation in its own right. A subculture is a drawing together of men in search of adjustment, in search of a solution to hard problems which seem insuperable within the frame-work of older groups. One particular frame of reference peculiar to a group of people becomes a subculture, with values of its own—generally in defiance of established conventions.

After showing us other subcultures—and Professor Cohen is unorthodox in his language and selection—the medical man, the professional gambler, the jitterbug all figure in his survey—he becomes specific about juvenile delinquents. He finds their subculture non-utilitarian, malicious, and negativistic (or, in racier idiom, he tells of delinquent boys boasting that they do things for the hell of it, are 'just plain mean' or 'guess we was just ornery'). He also finds it predominantly arising from working-class surroundings, and predominantly male. In explaining, Professor Cohen makes some disturbing discoveries about many favourite clichés of American democracy. He frequently belittles those who see in every juvenile delinquent no more than a personal problem. 'Who hasn't got problems?' he replies. Indeed, he attacks all viewpoints too firmly fixed. To him, evil does not flow from poisoned wells only, nor good from pure and crystal fountains: respectability and delinquency often come from the same source.

Ill-equipped to be judged—in the American educational and social system—by middle-class standards, the working-class boy is in the market for a solution. This book has some wise things to say on how he got there. The delinquent subculture is a solution. It makes non-conformity important. Above all, it gives the boy status—respect in the eyes of his fellows, unhampered by his disadvantages in competition with his social superiors. The clash and overlapping of classes is described with insight, but without sentimentality. In the course of a brilliant chapter on the American class structure, it emerges that the delinquent subculture

is a group reaction which allows the boy to express aggression against the main sources of his frustration. Also, it is essentially male. Delinquent girls are less versatile in their delinquency, less organized; their purpose even in delinquency is different.

The book deals largely with American conditions—frequent references to the social implication of racial mixture, and the American ambition to ‘get on’, lend it at times a charmingly regional flavour—but most of what it has to say on industrial conditions and non-conforming individuals also applies to this country. It ranges wide for references and footnotes, but retains throughout a refreshing independence of outlook, coupled with a certain suspicion of those who see in psycho-analytical activities the cure-all of juvenile delinquency. Indeed, it refuses to prescribe cure-alls of any kind. It establishes the delinquent subculture in the scheme of things; and in treating its limited problem with insight and imagination, lends a new perspective, indeed a new frame of reference to the social world of to-day.

MAX BENEDICT.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MALADJUSTED CHILDREN. (London: H.M.S.O. 1955. Pp. 180. 6s.)

This Report is ‘the first occasion on which a systematic review has been made of the various services available, and on which suggestions have been made for their proper co-ordination in the interests of the (maladjusted) child’. It will be difficult now for a student of psychology, social work and administration or child psychiatry, or for juvenile court magistrates or other interested people to ignore this practical, sensible and understanding survey. It will disappoint those who expected ‘a wholly novel insight . . . or new and even revolutionary ideas’ about treatment and it admits that its approach is ‘pedestrian’. It will be found, though, that its sobriety, commonsense and comprehensiveness are more persuasive and influential than a more imaginative and constructively critical approach.

The Report begins with an historical outline of the provisions for treatment in this country, continuing with a useful analysis and description of normality and maladjustment, in a manner as clear to the intelligent layman as it is a neat introduction for the student. The Ministry of Education’s definition of ‘maladjusted pupils’ is shown to be inadequate because: (1) it is unable to help identify maladjustment in any particular child; (2) it is too narrow to ensure that maladjustment is dealt with early enough; and (3) it is confined to children who ‘can and should be treated within the educational system.’

After an account of the present statutory authority for ascertainment and treatment, the Report discusses the adequacy of the establishments and services giving treatment, and returns to this later in discussing the training, supply and present shortage of all workers from psychiatrists to house-mothers. There is a severe and deplorable lack of both staff and premises of adequate quality, attributed broadly to public ignorance and prejudice about the nature of the different branches of medical and educational work in this field, and meagre finances and training schemes. A recommendation is made that by 1965 we secure the equivalent of 420 P.S.W.’s, in the child guidance service; in December 1954 there were about 150, most of whom were clustered in the South of England. The problem of attracting enough workers, with the right personal qualities for working with

children, is as grave as that of eliminating from among applicants those who are temperamentally unsuited to this work.

The Report makes a welcome confirmation of the view that 'the distinction between the maladjusted child and the delinquent must often be administrative rather than real', and recommends that, in general, every child who comes before a juvenile court, in need of special residential educational treatment, should be provided with such treatment by the L.E.A. rather than be sent to an approved school. Meetings of magistrates and clinic staff are recommended to 'increase mutual understanding, to break down prejudices and to heighten awareness of each others' problems.' It is to be hoped that the tendency of magistrates and approved schools to make more use of child guidance clinics continues, and that individual, psychologically directed methods increasingly replace purely social and punitive training.

The Report ends with a discussion of prevention, and with eight appendices. Those on the functions of juvenile courts and workings of child guidance clinics should clarify many misunderstandings, and the estimate of incidence of maladjustment should leave the reader in no doubt about the gravity of the problem.

Your reviewer has two reservations about the Report. It would be a sad and retrogressive policy if the section of the Report on 'independent and other boarding schools' were read in such a way as to make even more difficult the founding of original and experimental schools. We should remember that not long ago even such men as A. S. Neill, Otto Shaw, Lyward and David Wills were regarded as cranks or eccentrics. Your reviewer considers that if a conflict of the suitability of treatment (and the like) arises between the child guidance clinic and the administrative authority, in the interests of continuity of considered treatment, administrative convenience should be subordinated to considerations of therapy. This is now not necessarily the case. Psychotherapy must be paramount and the reasons for this paramountcy should have been emphasized unequivocally by the Report.

LEONARD BLOOM.

SPONTANEOUS YOUTH GROUPS. Ed. P. H. K. Kuenstler, M.A. (London: University of London Press. 1955. Pp. 76. 4s.)

This is a collection of seven sociological essays shedding light on some spontaneous corporate activities of young people, from street football groups of Liverpool to the 'Sweat Box' jazz-club of a modern housing estate. It is an attempt to sound the scope and limitations of a large subject which is, incidentally, acquiring a considerable literature and terminology of its own; here can be learnt about breakaway—face to face, splinter, and superimposed—groups, or about participating, organizing, democratic or autocratic leaders.

The connection with criminology is not always close, but as T. P. Morris suggests, the prophylactic function of many of the groups may be great. 'If a club, which organizes various activities manages to include a number of pre-delinquents, then, while its subjective purpose is the fruitful utilization of leisure, its objective consequence is to prevent or displace delinquency.'

Of particular interest is the very well written fourth chapter, by M. L. Turner and J. C. Spencer, who have not only studied antisocial, 'unclubbable', gang-boys, but have described their attempts to deal with the problem in its own East-

End setting. This is a task of the greatest difficulty for these youngsters must usually be reacting against a life history of intolerable stress at home, and are tackled just at the time when they have already tasted the joys of self-determined activities. Furthermore, as Morris points out, 'By segregating the "unclubbable" one may only succeed in emphasizing the difference between them and the rest of the neighbourhood, and so indirectly perpetuate the state of affairs it was intended to remedy.'

P. D. SCOTT.

TRUANTS FROM LIFE. By Bruno Bettelheim. (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press. 1955. Pp. xvi + 511. \$6.)

This companion volume to 'Love is not enough' by the same author, consists of a detailed account of four deeply disturbed children treated over a period of years at the Sonia Shankman Orthogenic School of the University of Chicago. It will be criticized by some for the relative superficiality of some of the interpretations, by others for the easy assumption of psychosomatic symptom formation. 'Finally he settled down to a very long siege of ringworm' which lasted for nearly two years. But for the majority the painstaking record of behaviour by several observers over a long period of time, together with the studies of family histories and careful follow up enquiries, will serve as a mine of factual information and stimulating speculation. It will appeal both to the expert and the student, and not only to those who are constantly handling severely disturbed and psychotic children.

To select from 500 closely packed pages material deserving of special comment is an unrewarding task, but mention may be made of one or two points of special interest. Warning is constantly given against the easy optimism that comes from attaching too great importance to the rapid improvement that so often takes place shortly after a child's admission to the school. The ensuing setback may not only be disappointing and discouraging to all concerned, but positively disastrous if a premature revision of the diagnosis and prognosis should have led, for example, to placement in a foster home.

Of equal interest is the observation that the development of an initial positive relationship with one member of the school staff may be facilitated by the possibility at the same time of maintaining and expressing feelings of hate and hostility towards the remainder.

This book can be recommended without hesitation. The reader is left with a lasting sense of admiration for those who are prepared to meet, every day and all day, and often night as well, the abnormal demands of these children of both sexes and all ages from six to sixteen.

ALAN MABERLY.

THE CRADLE OF THE PENITENTIARY. THE WALNUT STREET JAIL AT PHILADELPHIA, 1773-1835. By Negley K. Teeters, Temple University. (Sponsored by the Pennsylvania Prison Society. Pp. xii + 152. No price given.)

Students of prison history who are indebted to Professor Teeters for his book on the early efforts of the Pennsylvania Prison Society (1927) will be grateful for his new, well-documented history of the famous prison in Walnut Street, Phila-

delphia. The small cellhouse, built for sixteen prisoners within the precincts of the prison in 1790, marks the beginning of solitary confinement which was hailed by European reformers of the nineteenth century as the ideal penitentiary system. Our knowledge of that early experiment has so far been based on contemporary panegyrics, the writings of Caleb Lowmes, prison inspector; La Rochefoucauld, French writer and emigré; and Robert Turnbull, a lawyer from South Carolina. Only recently Thorsten Sellin published a brief critical account of those events based on general historical sources (*Trans. Amer. Phil. Soc.*, Pt. 1, 1953, pp. 326–30). The present author makes ample use of the Reports of the Prison Society, the Minutes of the Board of Inspectors and similar original material and gives a fascinating picture of the day to day administration of the old prison, but also of the unending struggle of progressive reformers with the grim reality of prison life in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. We learn that Walnut Street prison owes its reputation to a brief span of enlightened prison administration during the decade 1790–99. Solitary confinement as a substitute for capital punishment or as a disciplinary measure was only a minor aspect of a regime characterized by proper classification and discipline, provision of useful and remunerative work, medical care and effective supervision of the staff. At the turn of the century, when the population of the state increased rapidly, the standard of prison administration deteriorated. The records are evidence of the recurrent evils of prison life, overcrowding and idleness, insufficient classification, numerous escapes and indiscriminate pardon as a reward for informers. It is interesting to find the Rev. Louis Dwight of Boston, the protagonist of the rival Auburn system, as one of the most outspoken critics of that ‘almost incomparably wretched County Prison’ (1826). One has the impression that the erection of the two classical cellular prisons, the Western and Eastern Penitentiaries opened in 1826 and 1829, was not the outcome of beneficial experience in the small cellhouse, but rather an obvious reaction to the inveterate evils of the common gaol which disgraced even Walnut Street Prison after the glorious days of the 1790’s.

Professor Teeters draws this vivid picture of the ‘cradle of the penitentiary’ against the background of traditional penal methods in colonial America and in the Old World. The Quakers of Pennsylvania were far ahead of their contemporaries when they abolished stocks, pillories and whipping-post, rejected the death penalty for offences against property and insisted on productive work as a means of rehabilitating the criminal. At the same time the author emphasizes the influence of John Howard and his English followers, notably Sir Thomas Beevor of Norfolk. While wholehearted efforts for a responsible public administration and humane treatment, for adequate accommodation and facilities for work were essentials of Howard’s programme, I cannot share the view that he was ‘a strong advocate of solitary confinement as a means of reformation’, at least, not in the sense in which it was developed in the new penitentiaries which succeeded the prison in Walnut Street. While he insisted on separation at night and believed in the beneficial effect of a brief spell of solitude, he saw clearly that such favourable results ‘would wear off by long continuance, and a sullen insensibility may succeed’; a long spell of solitary confinement would be ‘more than human nature can bear without the hazard of distraction or despair.’ (Account of the principal Lazarettos, 1789, p. 169, note.)

M. GRÜNHUT.

SOCIAL GROUP WORK IN GREAT BRITAIN. Ed. Peter Kuenstler. (London: Faber and Faber. 1955. Pp. 172. 12s. 6d.)

Unlike the Miller of Dee, most of us are not jolly if we care for nobody and nobody cares for us. Whether we tryst, foregather or throng, we like to belong to groups. No doubt we differ, probably constitutionally and certainly as a result of experience and illness, in the proportion of our time we prefer to spend with others, in the sort of groups we choose and in the intensity and quality of our participation, from infancy to old age and from moment to moment. There is no reason to suppose that this basic need is different now from what it has always been, but the artificialities and exigencies of modern life, especially in towns, must have affected the ease and manner of association almost out of recognition. And only recently has it been discovered, or rediscovered, that the group is an effective approach, not only to the study of individuals but to influencing them and to treating their social ills. For these reasons man's self-consciousness of his group life is a necessary and inevitable development, and with it we must expect scientific observation of groups, training for group management, and 'social group work'.

This collection of essays, by eight eminent sociologists and educationalists, outlines the variety and development of modern social groups, spontaneous and otherwise. Its aim is to establish group study as a recognized speciality which need no longer be applied 'apologetically and even secretly'. It will encourage the scattered army of group workers (often untrained volunteers) to appreciate that there is more to their skill than intuition and that there is a growing body of knowledge which they might be trained to use.

Sheelah Forster, who writes about the Church, settlement and community centre, raises what is for readers of this journal likely to be the key problem—'Groups in this country appear to attract ordinary rather than "problem" people'. For our purposes it would seem that there are those who are capable of healthy group life and find it for themselves, there are those who are able to do so if they are helped to find the right sort of group and if the introduction to it is eased, there are those who have a more or less positive and pathological antipathy to any group, other than an antisocial one and, finally, those who are scarcely capable of any satisfying group relationships at all. If anything is to be done with the latter two sorts of people it will probably be through concerted action in which sociologists will play a large part. It seems that this book should be followed, as soon as the necessary work has been done, by a longish series of other ones to which it may be regarded as a valuable introduction.

P. D. SCOTT.

SOCIAL CASEWORK IN MARITAL PROBLEMS: A Study by a Group of Caseworkers. (London: Tavistock Publications Ltd. 1955. Pp. xii + 199. 15s.)

The Family Discussion Bureau was set up in 1948 and this book is an account of the first experimental years; it also outlines something of the theoretical basis of the casework methods used and gives examples of how the Bureau works.

During the past decade much attention has been given to the family and particularly to the relationships between its various members. The staff of the F.D.B. have based their work on the view that marriages are in some way—either satisfactorily or not—complementary relationships in which two people seek

satisfaction of their needs in their partner. A great deal thus depends upon the extent to which (a) these needs are reasonable, *i.e.* not too greatly based on child-like demands, (b) the partner's ability to meet these needs. Such a conception of marriage is, of course, only part of a whole way of thinking about human relationships which presupposes that no established and enduring contact between one individual and another is a purely chance relationship, but that needs have to be met in order to form all but the most superficial of human contacts.

The group of case-workers who have recorded their efforts have done a good job in formulating the theoretical basis of their work and trying to show how this is borne out in their clients' experiences and their casework with them. Your reviewer feels less happy about how the methods developed within the F.D.B. can be extended beyond its walls. What the workers in the Bureau learned has been very valuable to them and to the few families they were able to help: we are still left with massive problems in the community. As the authors point out, the difficulty of establishing a 'personal service' atmosphere in the social services is still very much with us. Many social workers and most social administrators are still far away from the idea of treating the consumers of the social services as 'clients'. This is the crucial problem in the application of dynamic psychology through social work in the Welfare State. There is an ever-present danger that social workers may retreat from this immense challenge into increasing their treatment skills in semi-isolation.

One wonders, for example, how far the Family Discussion Bureau has helped the Family Welfare Association to develop its own methods of working. This is not the comment of a philistine or a hard headed practical man, but of someone who looks daily—and more and more vainly—for some sign that social case-workers are as concerned about society as a whole and its long term welfare as they are about the adjustment of individuals.

R. C. WRIGHT.

THE PSYCHIATRIC INTERVIEW. By Harry Stack Sullivan. (Tavistock Publications Ltd. 1955. 28s.)

The late Dr. Stack Sullivan was a prominent American psychiatrist whose views, while orientated in the direction of Freud's psychopathology, were individualistically stated. Moreover, he was particularly interested in men's social relations seen as interpersonal communications. His conception of the interview would be described as a situation of two persons dynamically related to one another in such a way that the properties of personality were disclosed in the interplay. Former students of the interview regarded the situation as a specific mode of disclosure based upon an interrogation designed to display qualities for a special purpose, *e.g.* psychiatric diagnosis, vocation selection and counselling. In the author's view the examiner is essentially a participant, and in a broad sense the psychodynamics of transference are implied. In this regard the examiner is involved to a high degree. Conventionality must be minimized and freedom of expression between the group of two must have free play so that the cultural inclusions of both are illustrated and the person is disclosed as an individual and as a social unit also. The argument is very subtly developed and though there is much repetition and indeed padding, the reader is awakened to the complexity of interviewing as a task. In delinquency interviewing this approach is the only one that can disclose defences specific to such an interview.

E. M.

ABSTRACTS

(Under the direction of W. R. Bett, with the co-operation of J. P. Martin,
T. P. M. Morris, and J. C. Spencer.)

CRIMINOLOGY

LYLE W. SHANNON. 'The Spatial Distribution of Criminal Offences by States', *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 1954, **45**, 264-273.

This study re-examines the spatial distribution of criminal offences by states in the U.S.A. using offences known to the police and reported to the F.B.I. for the years 1946-52. This examination leads to the conclusion that the patterns of offences in sectional regions described earlier by Lottier remain in varying degrees ten years later. The relatively low crime rates for New England and the Middle Atlantic states are consistent, as are the relatively high rates of Mountain and Pacific states for crimes against property. The South Atlantic, East South Central and West South Central are consistently high on crimes against the person.

J. C. S.

JACK SOKOL. 'A Pioneer Approach in the Treatment of Offenders', *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 1954, **45**, 279-290.

The co-founder with Dr. Melitta Schmideberg of the Association for Psychiatric Treatment of Offenders describes the work and methods of the association in New York City since its foundation. The nature or changing character of referrals to the A.P.T.O. has been, in a sense, of the types of crimes committed in the city. In particular he discusses experience in the treatment of the drug addict.

J. C. S.

EDWARD J. FERENTZ: 'Mental Deficiency related to Crime', *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 1954, **45**, 299-307.

The author concludes that no serious allegation of a causal relationship between mental deficiency and criminal behaviour can be made before certain problems in the criterion and aetiology of mental deficiency are cleared up. The most useful field of study lies not in determining any causal relationship but rather in an examination of the processes of socialization involved in each.

J. C. S.

LLOYD E. OHLIN: 'The Routinization of Correctional Change', *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 1954, **45**, 400-411.

The correctional system is particularly resistant to change and changes when they occur are usually in response to severe and dramatic crises. The aim of this article is to emphasize the need for methods which provide for the continuous readjustment of policy and practice. The author illustrates this thesis through a study of the results of parole prediction research over a twenty-year period. The study proves the importance to practical prediction work of dealing with the hitherto neglected errors arising with the passing of time.

J. C. S.

KARL F. SCHUESSLER: 'Parole Prediction: Its History and Status', *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 1954, **45**, 425-431.

The Associate Professor of Sociology in Indiana University divides the approximately thirty-year period covered by this research movement into three phases: (1) initial efforts, (2) sceptical but constructive reaction and (3) post-war studies, predominantly methodological. He concludes that the significance of parole research to date seems to consist, not so much in the actuarial data produced, but rather in its delineation of the most troublesome problems in this field.

J. C. S.

PENOLOGY

PAUL W. KEVE: 'The Probation Officer Who Works Alone', *Federal Probation*, 1955, **19**, 3-7.

Many American Probation Officers work alone, without the assistance of a Probation Committee or Inspectors (the two English ways of dealing with the problem). Unsupervised casework may degenerate into the merely inadequate, the uncertain touch, or the uncritical routine approach. Possible remedies would be to employ other social workers (practising or retired) as consultants, to drive forty or fifty miles once a week to the nearest Child Guidance Clinic to discuss problems there, or for a State supervisory service to be set up.

J. P. M.

MAJOR-GENERAL W. H. MAGLIN: 'Rehabilitation the Keynote of the Army's Correctional Program', *Federal Probation*, 1955, **19**, 21-28.

A straight-forward and fairly comprehensive description of the U.S. Army's correctional work. Policy and procedure are stated but no assessments of effectiveness are given.

J. P. M.

THORSTEN SELLIN: 'The Philadelphia Gibbet Iron', *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 1955, **46**, 11.

Professor Sellin describes the history of the use of the gibbet in the American colonies. He believes that the gibbet iron frame in Atwater Kent Museum in Philadelphia (which is the occasion for this article) dates back to the early years of the Walnut Street prison.

J. C. S.

PSYCHIATRY

J. W. PARR: 'Psychiatric Treatment: A Layman's Question', *Approved Schools Gazette*, 1955, **49**, 263-265.

The author notes a rise in the numbers of Approved School boys recommended for psychiatric treatment and discusses some of the practical problems involved in providing it in a school. He questions whether frequent contact with psychologists and psychiatrists, especially before committal, develops a resistance to treatment in the boy.

T. P. M. M.

D. BUCKLE: 'The Contribution of Psychiatry to the Institutional Treatment of Juvenile Offenders', *Approved Schools Gazette*, 1955, **49**, 109, 117 *et seq.*

The rôle of the psychiatrist ranges from that of consultant to that of director of the institution, depending upon the legal or administrative conditions in European countries. Because he is concerned with re-socializing the offender, the boundaries of the psychiatrist's therapeutic field are indiscernible. Juvenile recidivists are grossly abnormal in a psychological sense—a fact often ignored—and direct psychotherapy is ineffectual. If, however, the general direction of emotional development can be altered the problems may tend to solve themselves in the process of growing up.

Treatment should be reformatory, but punishment will often have harmful effects on the seriously disturbed offender. He should understand the purpose of his committal; the protection of society, the treatment of the offender, and observation and diagnosis are distinct functions which ought to be fulfilled by three distinct types of institution. The creation of social patterns such as clubs, self-government agencies, etc., needs to be combined with psychological observation which can be used in individual therapy. In practice this element is often provided by the administrator of the institution, but ideally it is best left to the psychotherapist who can remain outside the institutional situation. After release the child should always feel free to return, and to regard the after-care officer as a therapeutic agent rather than an agent of the Court. It is usually difficult to select good personnel, a matter complicated by the problem of extremely low salaries. The motives, conscious and unconscious, of applicants should be carefully considered, making selection a highly technical matter requiring the co-operation of the psychologist. All personnel should be trained at least to the professional level of a social worker, through a general system of in-service training.

T. P. M. M.

SOCIOLOGY

GEOFFREY GORER: 'Modification of National Character: The Rôle of the Police in England', *Journal of Social Issues*, 1955, **11**, No. 2, 24–32.

By examining the institution of the English police force the author explores the hypothesis that the national character of a society may be modified or transformed over a given period through the selection of the personnel for institutions that are in constant contact with the mass of the population and in a position of some authority. He concludes that what started as an expedient to control criminality has resulted in a profound modification of the character of the urban population.

J. C. S.

P. W. BOWMAN: 'Defective Delinquency in Maine', *Journal of the Maine Medical Association*, 1955, **46**, 288–289, 292–295.

The vagueness of the term 'delinquency', and, in particular, 'defective delinquency', is discussed. An attempt was made to discover the social factors involved in 230 cases of juvenile and adult defective delinquents. A high proportion of offenders had a mentally retarded parent or parents of subnormal

intelligence. Provision of special classes for mentally retarded children in public school systems, and drastic improvement of psychiatric services at community as well as at institutional level are indicated. Such services should work in close collaboration with municipal courts and with medical practitioners. W. R. B.

CHARLES F. MURPHY: 'A Seal of Approval for Comic Books', *Federal Probation*, 1955, **19**, 19-20.

Very short description of methods of awarding a 'Seal of Approval' for comics in America. Describes some administrative problems involved.

J. P. M.

F. BADDELEY: 'The Liverpool Juvenile Liaison Scheme', *Approved Schools Gazette*, 1955, **49**, 226-229.

An account of the Liverpool Scheme from July 1949 until December 1954, outlining the principles upon which it operates.

T. P. M. M.

LAW

PAUL W. TAPPAN: 'Some Myths About the Sex Offender', *Federal Probation*, 1955, **19**, 7-12.

Debunks some of the main myths about sex offenders which led to the passing of many sexual psychopath laws in recent years. Emphasis is placed on the relatively trivial nature of most sex offences, the unlikelihood that they will lead to more serious ones, and the general ineffectiveness of methods of treatment. The new sex laws are criticized for setting some extremely dangerous precedents ' (1) for adjudicating individuals without ordinary due process—even in six states without a criminal charge, (2) for indeterminate commitments to mental hospitals of individuals who are not insane and who deviate little or not at all from normal psychologically, and (3) for providing hospital custody for a growing body of minor sex deviates who are to be held until "cured" though without treatment, at great cost to the taxpayer and with serious diminution of the facilities available for those mental patients who are seriously disturbed.'

J. P. M.

WALTER RAEURN, Q.C.: 'The Maladjusted Child', *Approved Schools Gazette*, 1955, **49**, 145-146.

No definition of 'maladjusted' is entirely adequate, and delinquency is not simply a development of maladjustment, although the law at present seems to accept this idea. For delinquent children there are Approved Schools to which they can be committed by law but for maladjusted children there are schools to which the Court has, broadly speaking, no power to commit. In practice a child is treated as maladjusted or delinquent not so much in accordance with what he *is*, as with what he has actually done. The maladjusted child is not an asset to an Approved School any more than the school is good for him. He may change from being simply maladjusted to being definitely delinquent. Because he needs special handling, the discipline of the school is also likely to suffer. There is a case for segregation in Approved Schools as the basis of 'passive offenders' as opposed to 'active' offenders, or descriptively, the 'unbalanced child' as opposed to the 'wilful child'.

T. P. M. M.

'Parents, Children and the Criminal Law', *Approved Schools Gazette*, 1955, 49, 127-129.

The law does not go far enough in dealing with the family of the juvenile offender. Children as a whole fall little short of adults in their capacity to control their actions. The stigma comes not from the Court but from the act, hence changing the name of the Court is somewhat futile. An extension in the powers of the Court is needed rather than a change in its constitution or procedure.

T. P. M. M.

EDUCATION

'The work of the De La Salle Brothers in Approved Schools', *Approved Schools Gazette*, 1955, 49, 79-85.

An exhaustive account of the beginnings of these schools in eighteenth-century France, together with an outline of their development in England and the principles of their educational régime.

T. P. M. M.

W. H. C. DAVEY: 'The Influence of Religion in Homes and Schools', *Approved Schools Gazette*, 1955, 49, 87-93.

The writer considers that religious influence must radiate from the staff of institutions in order to offset the absence of such influence in the home backgrounds of offenders. It may be better transmitted by example than by the spoken word. The need for integrating worship with some form of social activity associated with a church or chapel, and making it part of the boys' pattern of life after leaving the institution is stressed.

T. P. M. M.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

T. C. N. GIBBENS, M.D., D.P.M., is Senior Lecturer in Forensic Psychiatry at the Institute of Psychiatry, London; Hon. Physician to the Maudsley Hospital; and Psychiatrist to the L.C.C. Remand Homes. He is the author of 'Recent Trends in the Management of Psychopathic Offenders', which appeared in the *Brit. J. Delinq.*, October, 1951, and of Part III of the 'Symposium on Predictive Methods in the Treatment of Delinquency', *Brit. J. Delinq.*, VI, 2, September, 1955.

ANNELIESE WALKER is a Psychiatric Social Worker on the staff of the Institute of Psychiatry, doing research into psychological aspects of delinquency. She also works as a P.S.W. for the London County Council and was on the staff of the Maudsley Hospital from 1945-53.

PAUL de BERKER, Dip. Psych., B.Litt., studied at Institute of Experimental Psychology and Oriel College, Oxford; Assoc. of the British Psychological Society; member of the Association of Professional Psychotherapists; one-time Vocational Officer, Ministry of Labour Industrial Rehabilitation Service, now Senior Psychologist, H.M. Prison Service.

GORDON ROSE is Lecturer in Social Administration in the University of Manchester; author of '500 Borstal Boys' (Blackwell, 1954); other publications include 'Next Steps in Research', *Brit. J. Delinq.*, I, 311-319, 1952; 'Some Influences on English Penal Reform', *Sociological Review*, III, 35-46, 1955.

The British Journal of PSYCHOLOGY

EDITED BY JAMES DREVER

VOL. XLVII PART 2

MAY 1956

20s. NET

F. C. Bartlett. Changing scene

Gardner Murphy. The boundaries between the person and the world

J. C. Raven. The principle of individuation and the co-ordinates of conduct

P. E. Barratt. Use of the EEG in the study of imagery

J. A. Deutsch. A theory of insight, reasoning and latent learning

G. Jahoda. Sex differences in preferences for shapes: a cross-cultural replication

H. J. Butcher. A note on the scale product and related methods of scoring attitude scales

N. Mukerji. An investigation into the perception of height by rats

P. H. Venables and J. Tizard. Effect of stimulus light intensity on reaction time of schizophrenics

F. W. Warburton. The performance of one-year students in the Department of Education,
Manchester University

N. O'Connor and P. H. Venables. A note on the basal level of skin conductance and the Binet I.Q.
Publications Recently Received

The subscription price per volume, payable in advance, is 60s. net, post free.

Subscriptions may be sent to any bookseller or to the

Cambridge University Press

BENTLEY HOUSE, EUSTON ROAD, LONDON, N.W.1

The International Journal of Social Psychiatry

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY IN THE FIELD
OF INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH

SPRING ISSUE

The fourth issue will include articles by: Prof. Sylvain De Costa, Belgium, 'L'Evolution Des Methodes En Sociologie Et En Psychologie Sociale'; Dr. A. B. Monro, England, 'A Concept of Mental Health Obtained by Comparing a Normal and Disordered Population'; Dr. Edward Podolsky, U.S.A., 'Notes on Motiveless Murder'; Graham Foulds, Ph.D., England, 'The Ratio of General Intellectual Ability to Vocabulary Among Psychoneurotics'; Herbert C. Gunsburg, Ph.D., England, 'The Role of Psychologist in the Mental Deficiency Hospital'; Dr. N. S. Vahia, India, 'The Value and Limitations of a Psychiatric Department in a General Hospital in Bombay'; Dr. Anne Earle and Dr. B. V. Earle, British Guiana, 'Mental Illness in British Guiana'; Dr. Ornulf Odgaard, Norway, and Prof. G. Langfeldt, Norway, 'Work in Progress'; Reports, and Reviews.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION (Four Issues)

£2 or \$8 for Hospitals, Libraries, Firms, Government Offices, etc.

£1 5s. or \$5 for individual subscribers who certify that the Journal is for their personal use.

ALL ENQUIRIES SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY

The International Journal of Social Psychiatry

9 FELLOWS ROAD, LONDON, N.W.3, ENGLAND

The Journal of
CRIMINAL LAW
CRIMINOLOGY
and **POLICE SCIENCE**

TIMELY SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION

ON THE SUBJECT OF CRIME

ITS CAUSE,

DETECTION

AND PREVENTION

Bi-monthly; Annual subscription rate £3 per volume

RECENT ARTICLES INCLUDE:

Pioneers in Criminology, IX—Cesare Beccaria
How to Form a Citizens Crime Commission
The Juvenile Offender in Norway
Internal Police Communications
Post-Mortem Temperature and the Time of Death
The Japanese Police
The Selection and Phrasing of Lie-Detector Test Control Questions

**STANDARD
FEATURES:**

Criminal law notes and comments
Current notes
Book reviews
Police science technical and legal abstracts

PUBLISHED BY THE WILLIAMS & WILKINS CO. U.S.A. FOR THE NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

Distributed in the U.K. and Commonwealth by

Baillière, Tindall & Cox Ltd., 7-8 Henrietta St., London, W.C.2

DELINQUENT BOYS

The Culture of the Gang

ALBERT K. COHEN

The central and striking idea of this book is that the widespread crisis of juvenile delinquency can only be grappled with if one first understands delinquency as a persistent subculture that is traditional in certain neighbourhoods of our cities. This book takes up the little-explored problem of accounting for the delinquent subculture: why it is there to be joined, why it is located where it is, and why it has a peculiar content. W. J. H. Sprott writes in an Introduction: 'The great merit of Professor Cohen's book is that in it he has expounded the nature of the "social-background" approach clearly and vividly.'

21s. net

ROUTLEDGE & KEGAN PAUL